

# CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 8 (legislative day of January 6), 1942:

## SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

A. Cecil Snyder to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

## POSTMASTERS

### MISSOURI

Byron E. Thornhill, Archie.  
Charles A. Lawrence, Fenton.  
Fannie F. Norris, Wyatt.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, from whom we come and unto whom our spirits return, grant us Thy blessing this hour. Save us, we pray Thee, from dis-tempered thoughts that otherwise might disturb our hearts. Thou hast made us in Thine image; if we have marred the divine within, do Thou forgive and restore unto us the joy of kinship that Thy wisdom may be justified of her children. O Thou who are known and yet unknown, breath of our breath, in Thee may we live, move, and have our being.

In all times of our Nation's trials, when we have sought Thee, we have found Thee; in all times of our success Thou hast won for us our victories and guided our counselors. Great God of the ages past and of the years to come, by Thine unerring counsel and mercy lead us on 'til the night is gone and we approach with clearer vision that love which moves the sun in heaven and all the stars. Be Thou, dear Lord, with the chivalrous defenders of human freedom; we pray that their memory shall remain with us and with the children of other generations a sacred shrine. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2160. An act to amend section 3 of the act of March 19, 1918, entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States" (40 Stat. 450).

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Department of War.

6. Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board.

7. Federal Works Agency, Public Roads Administration.

8. Government Printing Office.

9. United States Courts, Administrative Office.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES M. HAMILTON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved this morning because of the sudden and unexpected death of my predecessor, Hon. Charles Mann Hamilton. I did not know until yesterday and then by a rather roundabout way that he had died suddenly, January 3, in a hospital in Florida; in fact, I did not hear of his death until after his burial yesterday.

Congressman Hamilton served in this House of Representatives for three terms and during that time he made an enviable record. He was loved and respected by everybody here and he enjoyed the same respect and affection from the people of the Forty-third Congressional District, whom he represented so ably and faithfully for three terms in the House of Representatives.

Representative Hamilton was born in Ripley, Chautauqua County, N. Y., January 23, 1874; attended the Ripley High School; the Fredonia, N. Y., Normal School; and the Pennsylvania Military College at Chester; interested in agricultural pursuits and in oil production; member of the State assembly, 1906-8; served in the State senate, 1908-12; represented the senate in 1911 on the New York State factory commission; delegate to the Republican National Convention at Chicago in 1912; elected as a Republican to the Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, and Sixty-fifth Congresses (March 4, 1913-March 3, 1919). It was at the suggestion of my friend Mr. Hamilton that I became a candidate for Congress in 1918. I have always felt grateful to my friend for his steadfast interest in my political career. His sudden passing comes to me as a shock and a great personal loss.

I sympathize deeply with Mrs. Hamilton in her bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point that I may extend my remarks in regard to my deceased predecessor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a talk I gave before the Wauwatosa "V" Club on December 15, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein and address by my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] and two others on What Does Freedom of Speech Mean to Us Today?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Dr. Robert Lindsay Rowland, of the Shippensburg Teachers College.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the Defiance County Farmers' Protective Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on January 2 I obtained consent to extend my remarks as of that date but failed to do so before the end of the session. I again ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address on the Bill of Rights by Dr. Judd, of the Texas State College for Women.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter to the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the National Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Railroad Shop Crafts of America.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## RESTRICTION ON CROP PRODUCTION SHOULD BE REMOVED

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, the statement that food will win the war may be an exaggeration, but without food no war can be won. One of the most pressing problems now confronting the American people has to do with the production of sufficient food, not only for ourselves but for those with whom we are allied. In fact, of all the longrange problems, embracing not only the war period but the time when peace comes, as come it will, one of the most important deals with those necessities which our farms must supply.

With the greatly increased demand for foods, especially meats and dairy products, acreage restrictions of feed

crops should be liberalized, if not, in fact, entirely removed. With the Government calling for more beef, pork, dairy products, and so on, and at the same time unduly limiting the production of meat-making crops, is like working the engine against the brakes. It simply does not make sense. With the 1942 planning season near at hand, the sooner such changes are announced the more effective they will be. The farmers of the United States are always to be depended upon. All that they ask is an opportunity to do in the most effective manner what should be done.

Closely connected with increased food production is that of the farm-labor situation. With machinery prices almost prohibitive, and with farm implements difficult to secure, the farmer must more and more turn to manpower and horsepower. Millions of men, many of them from the farms, are entering the military service or accepting positions in defense industries, so the problem of farm labor becomes doubly serious. The talk of city farmerettes doing farm work does not appeal to the average farmer. Trained and experienced men are needed. My feeling is that it may be necessary for liberal exemptions to be made in cases of young men subject to military service so that many may, where consistent, be deferred for farm work. If not, I fear a very great shortage of help on our farms, when help is needed as never before.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, simply to ask a question, I should like to ask my colleague from Missouri if he does not think it would be well if some Government agency would see to it that the price between the producer and the consumer was held at a level so that the consumer would not be overcharged? Because if we could find some way to get part of what the purchaser pays the retailer the farmers would benefit to a considerable extent. His troubles would be at an end.

Mr. NELSON. Obviously, I agree. That has been one of our real problems.

Mr. COCHRAN. On investigation you will find there has been a real increase in the price of foods, but on the other hand if you look deep into this increase you will also find that only a small percentage of this increase went into the pockets of the farmers but into the pockets of those who handled the commodities after they left the hands of the producers. I want to afford as much protection to the consumer as is possible, and the way to do it is to try to prevent uncalculated-for profits for those who act as distributors.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in H. R. 5727, I note that the Committee on Military Affairs has stricken out the heart of the bill, taking away from the Director of Civilian Defense the authority granted to him under Executive Order 8757. During the weeks of acute national emergency the Office of Civilian Defense has performed its many difficult tasks in a very satisfactory manner. Both nationally and locally its offices and personnel have tackled the problem of organizing the civilian population to face situations created by war conditions without panic and disorder in a most efficient manner. Why the work of this important agency should be disrupted at this point by placing it under another management is beyond me. The War Department—and I want to state that I have the highest respect for the leadership and personnel of our War Department—has more than its share of responsibility to carry at present and I do not see why we should burden it with another task which—as has been shown—can very well be taken care of by the present set-up. I honestly believe—and from discussions I have had with a number of people residing in various parts of our country I think the majority of our people agrees with me—that there is no necessity of disrupting the work of the Office of Civilian Defense by reorganizing it at this time. As far as I can see, the transfer of this agency to the War Department will only delay and confuse its important work and will do more harm than good. I hope and trust that the membership of the House will take all these factors into consideration when the bill is presented for disposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter I received in regard to the Farm Security Administration and the necessity for maintaining it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the regular business of the day and any previous orders heretofore entered, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a

eulogy recently delivered on the life of the late Victor P. Dessert by a former Member of this body and a former Member of the United States Senate, Hon. C. C. Dill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert some rate tables, also a statement from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he can tell us what legislation we will have up for consideration tomorrow and for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow the daylight-saving bill reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will come up. Monday will be District day. On Tuesday a bill will be considered from the Committee on Immigration. That bill was to come up before the recess, but we held it up until after the recess.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us what that bill is?

Mr. FISH. That is the Dickstein bill to cancel certain citizenships.

Mr. McCORMACK. The citizenship of certain persons.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that a controversial bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that there will be an amendment or amendments offered that might satisfy some who were for the bill but who had honest and reasonable feelings of opposition to the extent of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill will come up under a rule, anyway?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; it will come up under a rule.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We had a meeting yesterday and invited the Members of Congress who gave testimony on the matter to attend. We agreed on certain amendments which we shall offer when the bill is read for amendment. That was agreed to by everybody.

[Here the gavel fell.]



## CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5727 to provide protection of persons and property from bombing attacks in the United States, its Territories and possessions, to authorize the procurement of materials and supplies, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, may I state that it has been agreed by unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, 1 hour to be controlled by the ranking Member on the minority side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and 1 hour by myself.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5727, with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BARNES] in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, I desire to make a very brief explanation of the pending bill and to give a little of the history of how it happens that this bill has come to the floor of the House in its present form.

Some time last June the President of the United States, by Executive Order No. 8757, set up a civilian-defense organization and appointed a director of civilian defense with power to make appointments of the necessary clerical and other assistants he might need to administer whatever legislation the Congress should enact. This bill itself is nothing more or less than a bill to authorize an appropriation to meet the charges and expenses of administering the civilian-defense program.

The House Committee on Military Affairs gave this matter very careful study and made some vital changes in the form of the bill as passed by the Senate. After hearings and considerable executive consideration of the bill, the committee decided to limit the amount of the appropriation. Whereas the Senate bill left it to the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate whatever amount they deemed necessary, your committee limited the amount to \$100,000,000, this for the reason that the testimony before the committee was rather definite and certain that in the aggregate the expenses of the organization ought not to exceed approximately \$92,000,000. The committee in its fairness and in its effort to go along with the protection of our civilian population from injuries from bombing or other causes incident to the war gave this organization a leeway of about \$8,000,000 as a margin upon which to work, with the hope that that would be sufficient. Of course, that limits the power of the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate beyond \$100,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The \$8,000,000 was in addition to what the representatives of that particular activity had suggested as the probable maximum cost?

Mr. MAY. That is right. We thought there ought to be a little margin so that if the organization exceeded in some particular the amount they expected to expend, the Committee on Appropriations would have authority to appropriate that amount.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. That is a very proper allowance, I think.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman inform the House how this organization has been financed up to this time?

Mr. MAY. I am sorry to say to my good friend that I do not know how it has been financed, but I suppose it has been financed out of funds that have been made available by the Congress to the President under previous legislation, because I am sure he would not pay it himself and he would not undertake to administer it with funds that were not lawfully available.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULLEN. Why is the Director of Civilian Defense removed, under this bill?

Mr. MAY. I was just coming to that. When the House committee reached the part of the bill which provides for the appointment by Executive order of a civilian director, it struck out the phrase "Director of Civilian Defense" and inserted the phrase "Secretary of War." Of course, this was due to several considerations that were under discussion. As I recall, one of them was to the effect that the present Director of Civilian Defense is an extremely busy man, with a tremendous job on his hands as mayor of New York, and he possibly could not give to the civilian defense organization the time that some thought he should. Another consideration, the controlling one, I think, was that they thought that all the activities in defense of the people of this country ought to be under the War Department rather than separate from it.

My view, however, on that subject is this: Unless we intend to adopt a system in this country like Bismarck sponsored in Germany three-quarters of a century ago, and militarize the whole country, it would be well that when we are dealing with fire-fighting apparatus and with bomb protection and other things that are not strictly military, we confine them to civilian activities and separate them from the War Department.

Mr. CULLEN. The gentleman will admit that the civilian authorities have done good work.

Mr. MAY. Yes; the civilian work up to date, I think, has been fine, and it has all been voluntary and without compensation, wholly by patriotic persons eager to serve their country in these troublesome times.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask you to yield merely for the purpose of telling us, if you can, whether or not any of the money that is authorized to be appropriated might or will be used to help the people outside this 300-mile radius on each coast. For example, I am wondering if any of this money will be used to protect the people at Charlestown, Ind., where we have built one of the largest powder plants in the United States, or whether or not any of it will be used at LaPorte, Ind., and Madison, Ind., where the Government has spent millions and millions of dollars and built large projects that any enemy who wanted to bomb this country would first strike.

Mr. MAY. I always appreciate the courageous interest of my colleague from Indiana in his own people and in the people generally, and he has been very vigilant in his efforts to see to the proper writing of this legislation, but I think the gentleman will recall that Mayor LaGuardia, when he was before the committee, testified to the fact, and very sensibly so, I think, that they had established, or would establish, an area around the United States which anticipates, of course, that if we are ever bombed or injured it will be within a radius of 300 miles inland. Beyond that, he said, that all industrial centers of importance would be given protection, but the House committee, in its wisdom, and I think very wisely, said that none of this equipment should be furnished to either the city of New York or the city of Washington, the city of St. Louis or any other city in this country, that was financially able to furnish its own equipment. I am quite sure that the funds will not be used to the exclusion of any section of the country in favor of some other section of the country.

Mr. HARNESS. I just want to make this observation in that connection. One reason I believe the War Department should administer this program is that they are interested in protecting these great centers that are not within 300 miles of either coast. My recollection of Mr. LaGuardia's testimony is that this was to be used for protecting the people within 300 miles of each coast and leaving the others to their own resources.

Mr. MAY. I hope my colleague will read the record again, where he will find he is entirely mistaken, but let me get over one other point before I get away from this question.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CULLEN. Was this a unanimous report of the majority and the minority members of the committee?

Mr. MAY. No; it is not a unanimous report.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CULLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULLER. Am I correct in my understanding that the committee felt that

it was logical to let these expenditures reside in the discretion of the Office of Civilian Defense, but because of the personality now in control of that branch, that it should be lodged with the War Department?

Mr. MAY. I do not care to discuss that matter at this time.

Mr. CELLER. We would like to get information on that subject, because it is very important, particularly to us who come from the city of New York, whose mayor is also the officer of civilian defense.

Mr. MAY. I think that matter will come out in debate without the chairman of the committee having to state everything that happened in the committee and I will be obliged to decline to answer that question now.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I will yield to the gentleman in just a moment after I get in one or two thoughts here. I do not want to take up all my time answering questions.

The Secretary of War was asked whether or not he wanted to administer this act and whether or not he had the facilities with which properly to do it. His answer was that he did not have the facilities and neither did he have the time and that the task thrust upon him by the Congress in three declarations of war had made it imperative that it be given to the Civilian Defense organization as set up by the President, and I have always liked to follow the lead of the Secretary as far as I can. There is a vast difference now and when the bill was originally reported by your military committee. We have since then voted two declarations of war that has thrust us into a terrible world-wide war. Our Secretary of War has more burdens of a military character than he can easily endure and I do not wish to tie his hands or further burden him.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Do I understand, from the statement made by the chairman of the committee, that it is the recommendation of the War Department that they do not want to exercise the functions under this civil-defense organization?

Mr. MAY. That is correct, although the War Department is cooperating with the Civilian Defense organization.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. And as to the provision of the bill which states that this matter should be turned over to the Secretary of War, the Secretary says he does not want it.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the gentleman know that a civilian-defense organization in every hamlet and every city and village throughout the country has organized its fire department, and has its proper stations and proper instructions, something the War Department could not possibly manage, if they controlled the situation in respect to civilian defense?

Mr. MAY. I think it would be rather expensive for the War Department to go out into my district in the mountains, where I know that in every town in my district they have organized a civilian-defense organization under a civilian corps. To do so through a military organization might disrupt in many ways the splendid Civilian Defense organization now set up.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. It so happens that I come from the metropolitan area of the city of Detroit, where our industrial activities are at a maximum. I have inquiries from communities adjoining the city as to whether or not they would be furnished with additional fire equipment in case there was need for it. Will such equipment be furnished or loaned to the communities?

Mr. MAY. It will be loaned to the communities not able to furnish it themselves, and if the city of Detroit finds itself financially embarrassed and cannot do it, then of course the Civilian Defense Director will order the necessary equipment, and furnish it to that city, with the understanding that the city will pay for it when and if it can.

Mr. DONDERO. This does not come from the city of Detroit but from these municipalities on the outskirts of the city of Detroit, and they are not able to do it.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows that we would not have any director who would not protect those areas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I rise to serve notice that in my State and in my district, in particular, this job has not been done. I have just spent 10 or 12 days there, and I inquired into it specifically. I am in favor of the committee bill here presented, and I am for putting this in the hands of the War Department, where it belongs. I think the War Department should assume the responsibility.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, of course, understands that it is a huge task. They have only been at it a short time, and they have probably done the best that they could.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the reason I want the War Department to undertake it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Is it possible that the War Department would have an organization not so busy as the mayor of New York and the lady of the White House? I thought they were very busy. Have they the facilities as compared to the War Department?

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman would go out into the field and examine some of these cantonments and find that the Army is feeding and clothing and watering and taking care of about a million and a half men—

Mr. GIFFORD. I did that.

Mr. MAY. He would discover that the Army has a tremendous task on its own hands without assuming this added burden.

Mr. GIFFORD. Are not these others very busy themselves?

Mr. MAY. They are busy.

Mr. GIFFORD. I hear they are.

Mr. MAY. I think the gentleman knows Mr. LaGuardia well enough to know that as long as he was a Member of this House he did not have any hours of work. He did about as much work as any two of us usually, and he is still at it, and he rolls over and over like a wheel in going, and never loses a minute's time, and since the President set up this organization I think it is a rather strange thing for the Congress to summarily dissolve it by legislation.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. What is the system in England with reference to handling work of this type? Is it done by civilians?

Mr. MAY. It is based on this plan here—that is, the civilian organization.

Mr. CELLER. That is a civilian organization?

Mr. MAY. In connection with the Red Cross and other voluntary-service organizations.

Mr. CELLER. Then the gentleman's bill is inconsistent with the English system? Is that correct?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. It is inconsistent with it?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. I do not know that the gentleman gets my question. Is this bill consistent with the English system?

Mr. MAY. As a matter of fact, I do not know what the English system actually is, but I do know that the testimony before our committee is to the effect that they are following the English system in the original draft of the bill and that they have profited by their experience in dealing with the English system. That was the Director's testimony, and this pending bill would make a military unit of it.

I wish you would just let me take about 1 minute to make an explanation of one thing that has been done to this bill by the House committee. Generally speaking, I would say that the action of the House committee is to the effect of completely dethroning the civilian defense organization as set up by Executive order of the President. If the Congress is going to be permitted to appropriate under this legislation, they cannot appropriate to the War Department for this, because this is the civilian defense organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to review the general situation on this bill, if I may. It seems to me the time element has had something to do with it. In the first place, this bill was originally introduced in the House on September 29, and all the consideration which the House committee gave to this bill was prior to December 7, and the declarations of war. The bill itself was reported favorably to the House on November 26.



I mention that because I know it is true in my own case, and I think it is true of a great many members of the committee, that there has been considerable change of opinion on it.

I assume that most Members of the House realize that the Senate has passed a bill similar to this one. The only real difference between the Senate bill and the bill which the House Military Affairs Committee brings before you today is that the Senate bill places the administration of the act under the Civilian Defense Director. The House bill places it within the control of the War Department.

If you will study the situation on any Atlantic seaport or Pacific seaport you will realize that today the key man in any city is that man who controls military information and the anti-aircraft protection. Fundamentally, all control runs back to him. It does in the city of New York. Unfortunately the personality of the mayor of the great city of New York is of necessity inserted into this situation. I have talked to him about this bill. I have great respect and admiration for his capacity, for his ability, and for his energy. I daresay there is not a harder working man in the United States, but I feel certain that if he does not today he will soon realize that he cannot administer this act and continue to be the mayor of New York City, which he has been. I also feel certain that if he does not realize it, the President ought to make him realize it.

Since the committee reported this bill we have had further discussions among ourselves. I think I am perfectly free to make this statement, and I do this, of course, on my own responsibility: I believe that if the committee met this morning two-thirds of them would favor a committee amendment—of course, it cannot be offered as a committee amendment, but it will be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS]—extending the scope of this bill to the extent of making it mandatory that an additional Assistant Secretary of War be appointed for the complete administration of civilian defense in this country. While I did not look upon it with favor at first, and while I happen to know that Mr. Stimson has not seen fit to express himself, I feel certain that any man who has any conception of what civilian defense may be in the future, what he may be obliged to do under it, will recognize that sooner or later—and why not now—we must have an Assistant Secretary of War or someone in an official capacity in Washington charged with the entire administration of the program.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I think the gentleman will agree with me readily that Secretary Stimson is not in a position to express any view about this thing.

Mr. ANDREWS. I was under the impression that I inferred that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Assuming that later on the mayor of the city of New York should see fit to withdraw as head of the civilian defense, and this bill is passed, it will go back to the War Department under this bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. An Assistant Secretary of War would be appointed. Personally, I would not be at all disappointed to see Mayor LaGuardia appointed as Assistant Secretary of War in charge of civilian defense. I think he would do a fine job.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do you not think, coming from New York and knowing, as you do, the set-up of the present defense in every community in which the mayors of every city, under the direction of the head of civilian defense, have organized an army of civilians, ready to defend their cities with their lives, that that would be the proper place where it should go instead of the War Department, with more red tape and more red tape, because today you cannot get head or tail down in the War Department?

Mr. ANDREWS. I am sorry to say I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The gentleman pointed out that because Mayor LaGuardia was very busy, it was improper to ask him to shoulder this task. Does it naturally follow that you have to put it in the Army on that account?

Mr. ANDREWS. It seems to me that in every direction it leads to the Army before you get through.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The Army's job is the defense of the United States in a military way.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The mere fact that they will control the anti-aircraft guns will have nothing to do with ambulance service and fire service and such things. To put it in the Army would be to militarize the whole country, and we do not want that.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman think it is logical to legislate because of personalities? Secondly, what will be left in the Office of Civilian Defense if you withhold from this entity all these appropriations? What will the Office of Civilian Defense have to do?

Mr. ANDREWS. I assume that the Office of Civilian Defense would be promptly taken over by the Assistant Secretary of War.

Mr. CELLER. Have we any assurance of that?

Mr. ANDREWS. It is the perfectly natural thing to expect.

Mr. CELLER. We are not setting up an Assistant Secretary of War here.

Mr. ANDREWS. I have already stated that such an amendment would be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS]. I have attempted to give my picture of the bill. I believe the amendment should be supported.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one brief question?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In my own group a civilian-defense program has been mapped out and places of safety and shelter designated for everybody in the District.

Mr. ANDREWS. So much the better.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The War Department could not possibly do that. The people have even gone into their own pockets for the construction of shelters, and I am sure they are satisfied with the present set-up.

Mr. ANDREWS. Obviously the War Department will take that all over.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it contemplated that the \$100,000,000 here authorized will provide all of the civilian defense that the various communities wish to install? This would not begin to pay for it.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not believe that is the notion. Whether it will pay for it or not, it is a start.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is this supposed to pay for all of the civilian-defense efforts of all the communities of the United States?

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not believe that is the contention. It is a start. It will be used to buy fire equipment, gas masks, to give educational orders and many things of that kind.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. It is fair to say, is it not, that the testimony before the committee was to the effect that this \$100,000,000, or the greater part of it would be consumed in the purchase of gas masks, fire equipment, and for a few educational orders?

Mr. ANDREWS. I believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. ELSTON. No provision is made that this \$100,000,000 shall be used for the erection of shelters or any other form of protection for the civilian population.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Speaking for the right arm of Massachusetts, comprising 15 towns, all of which were represented at a meeting, they have raised fairly large sums for civilian defense. We are doing pretty well and we are interested. We are in the path of any enemy air attack on Mitchel Field. We are watching, therefore, for Mitchel Field today. We are interested in civilian defense. I express the hope that the heads of these organizations will not be selected because of social position. The lady in the White House—who is her assistant?

Mr. ANDREWS. I could not tell the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mrs. Morgenthau, is it not? I have nothing against these delightful ladies, but we have a suspicion

that social position has something to do with it. I rather think there are Reserve officers too old for active service yet who would be highly competent for this job.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the most important thing in connection with this legislation is that something be done without further delay. There is tremendous responsibility on all of us with reference to providing civilian defense, but up until now the job has not been done.

I am the author of the amendment which struck out the Office of Civilian Defense and inserted the Secretary of War. In offering this amendment I had no interest in the personalities which have been injected into the debate on the bill. There are certain fundamental things which should be considered in connection with this bill and which I feel the House should act upon. In the first place, civilian defense is one of the duties of the Army just as definitely and just as positively as the defense or employment of the military personnel can be. That is a matter upon which all military men are agreed. They are not free to talk because Army regulations prohibit them from testifying in opposition to a bill supported by the Department. If free to talk, however, they would all agree that the defense of the civilian population is one of the duties of the Army of the United States. That has always been true, but much more so now that civilians are the object of attack just as much as the military personnel. This is the first fundamental thing involved, and I may state further that we can all appreciate right at this time that certain preparations have been made for the defense of the Capital against air attack. You do not know what they are and I do not know what they are. The Army officials charged with the defense of the city of Washington do know what these preparations are, and they are the only ones who do. How can there be an effective civilian agency charged with the defense of the civilian population and the duty of placing the civilian population in such position that it will not be in danger of our own gunfire when the civilian organization does not and cannot know what the defense plans are? The Army must be in charge of placing the civilian population in such position that civilians will not be within the range of our own anti-aircraft guns which now surround this Capital City.

Whether the War Department wants to assume this duty or not, whether the letter which will be produced here from the Secretary of War states that they do not want it or cannot carry it out, is beside the point. It is definitely and positively their duty to do it, and, whether they want to do it or not, they must be compelled to undertake this military duty which belongs to them.

There is another matter here. The more you separate the obligations and the duties involved in this thing, the less coordination you will have. If you will

refer to the hearings, you will find one of the principal items sought under the bill in the \$100,000,000 appropriation is gas masks, and particularly educational orders to train factories and tool them so that they can turn out these gas masks. On the other hand, you will find that the Army now has on hand some 3,700,000 gas masks, with an Army of 1,700,000. The Army has developed an industry in the United States capable of turning them out in quantity at one-half the cost that they paid for the ones they have had manufactured for the military personnel. I believe you will find they are now in position to turn them out on a minute's notice at the rate of 90,000 a day. While they had this production all keyed up and ready to go, the Director of Civilian Defense came before our committee and talked at length about educational orders to train factories to make gas masks. The Director did not know, and would not know, that we already have the industry organized in the United States.

Here is another thing: If the Congress is going to do its legislative duty, it ought to do all of it. The bill as presented to the committee called for recognition of an agency created by an Executive order and for the placing at its disposal originally of an unlimited amount of money. Under the bill reported by the committee this is limited to \$100,000,000. Here is an agency not created by an act of Congress, here is a director not elected by the people or confirmed by the Senate, who is given power to expend \$100,000,000. I know of no other instance, even in the defense program, in which any person filling an office created by Executive order, who has neither been elected nor confirmed by the Senate, has the power to expend public funds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, in each instance this authority is exercised under the responsibility of some officer created by law, whether under the Constitution or by statute. It is a dangerous departure for us to take at this time in creating a precedent. If we are going to pass such authorization, if we are going to discharge our legislative duty in this regard, let us sit down and write a bill creating the Office of Civilian Defense and by statute define its duties and powers and create the office of the official who will exercise them. We go further than that here. If you will read the last two paragraphs of this bill you will find that this officer, neither elected by the people nor confirmed by the Senate whose office has not been created by law, is given the power, if the Office of Civilian Defense stays in here, to make regulations, the violation of which is made a penal offense under this bill. The violation of the regulations would be punishable by fine and imprisonment. Here we are giving the power to a man whose office has no legal existence as far as this legislative body is concerned, to create criminal offenses.

During times of war we are going to have to live under many military regulations. It may be that on many occa-

sions in this Capital City we will have to live under martial law. That cannot be helped. That is an incident of war. The Military Establishment and the War Department has the power to make those regulations and to carry out martial law. Why should we set up an agency separate from the Army which will have the power to make further regulations for us to live under? We will then be living under two authorities, one martial law and the other a civilian organization making penal offenses.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman believe the President of the United States, under his constitutional power as Commander in Chief of the armed forces and under numerous acts of legislation passed by this Congress, has the power to appoint a civilian director?

Mr. KILDAY. I have not raised that question. Of course, he has the power to create the Office of Civilian Defense. But this Congress has not until this minute passed any law authorizing any of those officers, created by Executive order, to expend public funds. They are operating either under the constitutional power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and as President of the United States, or they are acting in accordance with some authority delegated from one of the Cabinet members. They do not act upon their own responsibility.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, whether Mayor LaGuardia or the War Department administers this act is something for others to decide. What we need is action. It seems so futile to hold this matter up by arguments. We are at war.

My home city of San Francisco is the focal point for all activities on the West coast, as well as for the entire Pacific sphere of operations.

Not only San Francisco, but all the cities and target areas in that vulnerable section are wiring asking that we act at once.

The emergency equipment, apparatus, gas masks, and medical supplies which will be furnished under authority of this bill are requested now.

The citizens in the different communities are being thoroughly organized to take care of all eventualities in case of attack, but the local authorities simply have not the funds to furnish the supplies.

Mayor Rossi has appointed Chief of Police Charles Dullea coordinator of all civilian-defense activities for San Francisco. Chief Dullea is a man of action—aggressive, resourceful, and fearless. He never shirks.

He typifies the type of man selected in other communities, and Congress may rest assured supplies and facilities allotted to the several areas will be wisely and judiciously distributed.

The black-outs in our city have been perfected, and latest reports are that what little confusion occurred when the



first black-outs were found necessary has been entirely eliminated and the last two have been 100 percent.

Herbert Morrison, Britain's Minister of Home Security, said in an interview with Miss Inez Robb, London correspondent of International News Service:

First. Every citizen must play a part in any successful civilian-defense program. Every citizen must feel he has a share of responsibility in the set-up.

Second. You have such long stretches of coast. In a way, that makes your problem both more difficult and yet easier than ours. More difficult because of the uncertainty as to where the enemy will strike. My best practical advice on the subject would be first to study carefully where the most probable areas of attack lie and, secondly, to try to visualize and prepare for the problems that would arise from such attack.

Third. Certainly all factories must be blacked out and probably all danger zones.

Fourth. Any attack might be made with incendiary bombs. Nothing is more important than an adequate watch over and protection of such districts. Remember incendiaries can and do come by the thousands.

Fifth. Also, it is absolutely essential to give people who have been bombed out of their homes the feeling that they will not be permitted to suffer destitution. Give them the feeling that they will be stood on their feet and are not going to be deserted when they need aid the most. Above all, cut the red tape and see that the bombed-out persons are not handed by one agency to another, passed from one board to another board. Get something done for them immediately. Try to make the process as short and sympathetic as possible. Nothing is more disheartening to bombed-out people than to stand in line after line, talking to groups of officials.

Sixth. Until your authorities contradict me, I shall have great faith in skyscrapers. It is our experience here that a steel-frame, concrete-reinforced building withstands a bombing better than any other type of structure.

Another pressing reason why this measure should be passed at once is the question of priorities. While there is no reason to believe the orders will be delayed downtown, still it takes time to place the requisitions, manufacture the articles, have them packed and shipped, and finally delivered to the general public. One month has elapsed since the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor.

My colleagues, I hope you will pass legislation for aid to civilian defense at once.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I think we must all be pretty well agreed on the emergent need for this sort of legislation. It is a very different situation today in the United States, in fact, in the world, than that which existed on October 9, when the Committee on Military Affairs was holding hearings on this bill. Likewise, a very different situation exists now to that which prevailed when the bill was reported a few days after that time.

I am one of those who feels, and I am sure you agree with me, that the situation is serious and that the responsibility is ours. Something ought to be done immediately in order to straighten out this apparent tangled situation that exists in the administration of civilian

defense. I am sure I speak the sentiments of every Member of this House—I know I speak my own—when I say that this is a lot bigger question than personalities. I regret very much that in the committee—and I anticipate in some respects on the floor of this House the same thing will occur—questions of personalities entered into the discussion of this legislation. I am one of those who believe that, in view of the unity that now prevails throughout the country and the building up of public sentiment for an efficient administration along all lines, the matter of civilian defense is going to work itself out, so I do not want to get into a discussion of that question unless forced to do so.

I disagree with my esteemed friend and colleague from Texas that civilian defense is necessarily a matter of military defense. He, or perhaps it was the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], made mention of the fact that right around this Capitol and around the office buildings at this moment are certain anti-aircraft guns and other equipment for the defense of this Capitol and of this city. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that every one of these guns is manned by a soldier. When it comes to the absolute military defense of this Nation, the Army is in charge, do not forget that—whether it is in Washington, or in Buffalo, or New Orleans, or wherever it is. The Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, the Coast Artillery are looking after the military defense of the country.

This is the situation: Civilian defense in the main deals with what? Fire departments, water departments, hospitals, ambulances, the handling of the civilian population, fires in cities, forest fires, black-outs, air-raid shelters, and distribution of gas masks. Are you willing to turn everything in the United States over to the military? I yield to no man on this floor in my friendship and loyalty to the War Department. I yield to no man in this House in my advocacy of national defense at all times. This is not only true now but it has been true in the years that are gone, including the 11 years I have been in this body and on the Committee on Military Affairs. But I am not willing to completely militarize this country and say that I want the military to run the water department and the fire department in my own little city of El Paso, of which I once happened to be the mayor. That is what it will result in if you adopt this amendment, and we might just as well face the music.

My Commander in Chief, through the Secretary of War, who is charged with the military defense of this country, only the day before yesterday, on January 6, wrote an official letter to the gentleman from Kentucky, Hon. ANDREW J. MAY, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. I have a copy of this letter in my hand, and I shall read these few sentences:

The War Department believes that it should not undertake added duties which the amended House bill would oblige it to assume. The facilities, supplies, and services which may be secured under the authorization would require the diversion of a great number of military personnel from their primary mission of combating the enemy or

preparing for such combat. The Army has no storage facilities which can be made available nor is its distribution system suited to storage and distribution of supplies to civilian communities. The military supply system is organized to serve troops in training and combat areas which are usually distant from centers of population. Since the types of supplies required for the protection of the civilians vary from those required by military personnel and must be stored and distributed in thousands of communities which may be removed from military areas, a separate supply system would be required. This system, if operated by the Army, would require great numbers of military personnel.

In view of the present local civilian-defense organization established throughout the country by the Office of Civilian Defense and its access to the services of existing volunteer organizations, it is probable that the facilities, supplies, and services could be effectuated in a shorter time and with less expense than they could were they undertaken by the Army.

Mr. Chairman, we are in the worst war in all recorded history. A different situation is prevailing today than when we reported out this bill on October 9. As for my part, I have confidence in the mayors, the sheriffs, judges, the American Legion posts, all patriotic organizations, and the home people, on this question of local self-government in the thousands of cities, communities, and villages throughout the country. As for me, I am still following my Commander in Chief and the Secretary of War on a matter of this sort. They are charged with the national defense. They are experts and I accept their advice.

You have this situation, too. If we are to believe the message of the President delivered from that rostrum 2 or 3 days ago, we may find ourselves fighting in every part of the world. We are going to enlarge our Army very materially. We do not have enough personnel now to carry on the war we are going to have to engage in. We have raised and lowered the draft age in order to get a larger Army. If you amend this bill, covering functions primarily the duty of every community in the United States through its mayors, its fire chiefs, its water superintendents, its local, city, and county hospitals, its ambulances, and its fire-fighting equipment, covering purely civilian affairs in local communities, and turn these functions over to the Army, and drag into every community of the United States Regular Army personnel, when they are needed to fight, when they are needed for combat service, then you are just going to almost disrupt your Army, because it will take untold thousands of persons to do it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This is just a little off of what the gentleman is speaking about, but I notice that the bill is very restricted in that it provides only for protection against bombing. It seems to me that is probably one of the least likely troubles we shall have. How about sabotage and other troubles?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not recall the exact language of the bill, but my recollection is that it carries authority for the initiation of or at least cooperation

with all civilian activities in every community.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The bill does not provide a thing in the world except protection against bombing, and I wonder if the gentleman does not think we should extend the scope of the bill.

Mr. THOMASON. If it does not, speaking for myself, I would be very happy to do that. This bill was written some time ago and was reported to the House on October 9, when a lot of us did not take it too seriously. I suppose many gentlemen belonged to the group that believed there could not happen what occurred at Pearl Harbor, but I am convinced that when it comes to New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Alaska, or Panama, we need not be surprised at anything, and everything possible must be done now for adequate protection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has made a very persuasive argument as to why this power should not be lodged in the War Department. The gentleman has discussed the personnel that will be required and I am wondering if the gentleman fully realizes that under the present set-up the directing personnel is composed largely of Mr. LaGuardia and Mrs. Roosevelt and that the real work is being done by civilians throughout the country. As I understand it, it is contemplated that regardless of who has control, the present plan will be carried out. If this is true, then if this matter is transferred to the War Department Mayor LaGuardia will act as the representative of the War Department and Mrs. Roosevelt will also be retained as the representative of the War Department. If an Assistant Secretary of War is placed in charge of the Civilian Defense that will compel Mayor LaGuardia to resign as mayor if he acts as Assistant Secretary of War.

Mr. THOMASON. I am sorry, but I cannot yield further.

Mr. MICHENER. Am I not right about that?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not know, but I would assume that the gentleman is going to support an amendment to set up an Assistant Secretary of War. That might mean the designation of Mayor LaGuardia in the office as Assistant Secretary of War, which is the very thing you Republicans are so bitter about.

Mr. MICHENER. I am asking the gentleman—

Mr. THOMASON. I do not yield further.

I think we can assume, or, as we say down in west Texas, we can operate on a hunch that when this is all over and this storm has passed regarding the form of this legislation there will probably be some resignations, and maybe a new Administrator. I hold no brief for the mayor of New York, although I will say this: I have seen him in this House

and I have seen him in New York and I know his record in World War No. 1, and I undertake to say that he is a highly patriotic citizen, with courage and ability and honesty of a very high order. And I undertake to say this, too: It was rather natural some months ago when there were many in this House who thought we would never be drawn into the war, and perhaps we rather ridiculed the idea at that time of civilian defense that he should be the one chosen for this reason. In addition to his wide and successful experience as soldier and legislator, he happened to be president of the United States Conference of Mayors, which is an organization of which the mayor of every city in the United States of over 30,000 people is a member. So it seems to me that it started out as a rather local, self-governing affair, and it would be natural that the president of that great organization, speaking for the mayor of my city, who is a member of the organization, that they should look to the mayor of New York for civilian defense, inasmuch as he is the mayor of the greatest city in this country. If some of you Members would lay aside your hatred and prejudice against LaGuardia and Mrs. Roosevelt, this bill would pass unanimously.

Mr. MAY. And it is a system of local self-government without military control.

Mr. THOMASON. I repeat to my chairman that I want the military to run the antiaircraft guns in Washington, I want them to run the Coast Guard and the Navy, I want them to provide border protection down where I live, and I want the Army to do that in the city of El Paso, but I do not want the Army running my water department or butting into the affairs of my chief of the fire department as long as he is doing a good job. The only thing in the world that the head of Civilian Defense has done—and I can show you report after report that they have filed—is that they have cooperated with the Corps of Engineers and they have cooperated with every local city and county, and this cooperation has only been in the matter of fire protection, water protection, providing gas masks, and kindred forms of civilian defense. Now, you go ahead and pass this bill and you will want the Army down in Georgia or out in Ohio or down in Texas to go into the distribution of gas masks in every community. When the mayors of all the large cities, plus the American Legion and the Veterans of the World War and the patriotic women's and men's organizations are cooperating in this work, why not, in Heaven's name, give them a chance to perform this function? The Army is going to be busy fighting. Surely we civilians can keep the home fires burning.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. In view of the fact that we all now know of the

many ramifying and important activities of the civilian-defense program, and in view of the fact that the Administrator would have an advisory board or any advisory group that he may want, I hope the distinguished gentleman from Texas is willing to say that whoever administers this program should give his entire time to it.

Mr. THOMASON. I subscribe to that principle, but I do not happen to be Commander in Chief of the Army, and I did not have anything to do with naming Mayor LaGuardia, but as for me, I am not going to engage in any personalities in this discussion. I concur in the views of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE] that this is a big job in itself, and certainly being mayor of the city of New York is a big job, next to that of the President of the United States. I do not see how a man can physically perform the duties of both mayor of the city of New York and Director of Civilian Defense. That, however, is not my responsibility right now, and I am thinking of the great principle involved here, and I am not willing to militarize this country and say that the Army shall go into my city or into your city, into the city of Baltimore or any other city and take charge of its fire departments, its first aid, and the distribution of gas masks, and other activities that are purely civilian in nature. We must win this war. I plead for unity. I think we ought to follow the wishes and advice of the War Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD].

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good bill, and I think it should pass. We in California are particularly interested in the bill. I wonder if there is enough money here to take care of those who really need it right now, and those who may need protection later. There should be two categories made up of those who may become the war front, such as the eastern coast or the western coast, and then those in the interior. I, for one, would not deny anything to those people who have plants in the interior, which should be protected. In California we have a peculiar situation. In addition to all of these plants, we have great areas that are covered with brush, not forests such as those in Pennsylvania and other States, but brush that, when lighted, cause tremendous fires. I occupied the chairmanship of the Los Angeles County Forestry Department 3 years ago, when over 19,000 acres burned and destroyed about 300 homes. There were 4,800 men engaged to control this fire. These fires can begin through shell fire or through sabotage, and we have to watch them to see that they are taken care of. In addition to these we have our great water systems; we have the Hetch-Hetchy in San Francisco and the one in Los Angeles; we have reservoirs, open siphons, and great ditches, many flood-control dams; and then we have tank farms and our oil industry. Those things have all to be protected. However, if the money is not



sufficient to give proper protection and meet the needs of the coasts which may become the war fronts, and of the interior, I think the bill at a later date can be supplemented.

In regard to the jurisdiction, this is a serious matter and it is something that cannot be temporized with. The people of the country have confidence in the Army. They know that the Army knows how to do it, and they are not inclined to experiment with somebody who does not know how to do the matter. That feeling is particularly true in California, and I think we should not gamble at a time like this on a bill like this, where the interests of so many people are at stake. The Army knows how, and we know that they can coordinate and correlate their efforts. I hope the bill as written will go through. I yield back whatever time I have left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one-half minute.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to ask some questions and to get some real information as to the final opinion of the Military Affairs Committee. Does that committee really want the bill it reports, or does that committee want the bill that was reported out originally by the Senate? We ought to be enlightened upon that subject, and we have not been enlightened thus far. We have divergent views.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. FADDIS. The Committee on Military Affairs reported the present bill to the House.

Mr. CELLER. What was the vote? Can the gentleman tell?

Mr. FADDIS. I do not know exactly what the vote was, but the bill was reported by a majority of one.

Mr. MAY. It was reported out by a majority of one, with four members absent.

Mr. FADDIS. Does the gentleman from Kentucky care to give us the views of those four members?

Mr. CELLER. That was indeed a very, very close vote on this bill, and we ought to have an opportunity to hear some of the divergent views, so that we who are nonexperts, so to speak, can make up our minds what to do. I am in a quandary.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. When the bill was originally reported out by the Military Affairs Committee it was reported out by a unanimous vote.

Mr. CELLER. Apparently there has been a change of heart.

Mr. THOMASON. And I would like to say for the RECORD that that bill was reported out on October 9, before there was any expression from the War Department along the lines of the letter written the day before yesterday, in which the Secretary says that they cannot handle the matter, and what are we going to do about it?

Mr. CELLER. Then I think we should be permitted to express our views freely

and openly, and the members of the Military Affairs Committee should explain to us without fear or favor. This occurs to me definitely: We certainly should not legislate with any view of spite or with any view of hate or with any view of personalities. Either the Office of Civilian Defense is an appropriate and proper agency or it is not. We must determine that first. If it is an appropriate and proper agency, then we must give it appropriate appropriations so that it can function properly. If the head of that agency is not performing his duties properly—I have no knowledge that he has not—there is ample remedy. The President, who proposed him, can depose him. We should not attempt to depose anyone by indirection, by withholding appropriations from the O. C. D. and giving them to the War Department, especially since the Secretary of War in his letter practically says his Department should not have the bestowal of the moneys.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Clason].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the passage of legislation providing adequate funds for the organization of civilian defense throughout the United States. The amount authorized to be expended for that purpose under the terms of this bill is \$100,000,000. Obviously, if the plans of the Director of Civilian Defense, Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, are to be carried out, much larger amounts will have to be authorized and appropriated in the future. The pumpers, hose, and other fire-fighting equipment which are to be secured under the program outlined by the Director represent an expenditure of \$57,338,842. This equipment can undoubtedly be used to advantage even if the enemy never reaches our shore. The emergency medical supplies are undoubtedly a first-class investment which will be used to good advantage during the next few months.

Already the Army has secured between three and four million gas masks for the men in service, while 3 manufacturing plants, including 1 in Massachusetts, have made and delivered 40,000 civilian gas masks. When the hearings on this bill were held before the Military Affairs Committee it was planned to purchase 5,000,000 of these masks after equipping 20 plants to manufacture them. At that time the cost of 5,000,000 gas masks and the manufacturing equipment was estimated at \$26,548,014. As 50,000,000 people live within 300 miles of the coast of the United States, it will be necessary for future orders to be placed for a sufficient number of these gas masks to supply the needs of this population under some future authorization.

The committee has written this bill in a form to place it under the War Department. I believe that the War Department can be of real service and save millions of dollars by acting as purchasing agent for civilian defense. It does not seem either necessary or wise to set up another purchasing bureau in the Government in view of the testimony which has been given to the committee by Maj. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, Quartermaster General of the United States

Army. The War Department is ready, willing, and in a position to buy all of these supplies without any particular burden being placed upon its present facilities. This is shown by the testimony given on page 39 of the hearings, in the following language:

Mr. ELSTON. General, are there sufficient plant facilities for the production of all these items?

General GREGORY. Yes, sir; it is a question of material, available material. It is all standard stuff which is now being produced by commercial concerns, except the assembly. There is an assembly job on these trucks.

Mr. ELSTON. You would not have to spend any money, then, to expand existing plants?

General GREGORY. I do not believe so.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. They are probably pretty well slowed down by priorities?

General GREGORY. Yes; it would be just a question of obtaining material. The hardest thing to obtain is pumps, and they have plenty of facilities for making pumps now. It is just a question of getting material.

Mr. THOMAS. General, do you think that the War Department is properly equipped to take care of the purchasing of all these different things?

General GREGORY. Yes, sir; it would only be a percentage of what we are procuring now, and it is in line with similar equipment which we are now procuring.

Mr. THOMAS. Right along the same lines?

General GREGORY. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you believe that the present set-up for purchasing gas masks, clothing, and all the different things that are being purchased for the Army is satisfactorily working? The point I am trying to get at is, Would it be better for the War Department to do the whole thing alone, or continue on the present system of having the War Department and the Office of Production Management people dovetail into your organization? The Office of Production Management are in on almost every purchase.

General GREGORY. The Office of Production Management approves every procurement above \$500,000. In general, they accept our recommendations. The main divergence from our ordinary system of procurement is in the question of distribution of orders.

In view of this testimony, I believe that we should pass the bill in its present form, in order that the War Department may be the agent of the Government in expending not only the \$100,000,000 mentioned but the additional huge amounts which will undoubtedly be called for.

I join with others who have spoken before me in expressing my sincere appreciation of the fine work which has already been done by the Director of Civilian Defense, Mayor LaGuardia, and those who have acted with him. I believe that he has built up a spirit of cooperation in every community in the country. This bill will in no way affect the performance of the duties entrusted to the Director of Civilian Defense by the President. I am sure that the members of such great organizations as the State Guards which have been organized in the various States, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and countless other national and local organizations, as well as millions of private citizens who have already made their services available, will continue their very effective work under competent leadership to assure to the civilian population of our country adequate protection and safety from enemy attacks. I believe that the amount of money authorized by this bill should be expended, even if no such

attack ever comes, because of the feeling of security which it will give to our people and thereby maintain the present high morale prevailing in the United States.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have been deeply impressed by the statements made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and I want to reiterate that I am in favor of the bill setting up control of all of this under the War Department. I think before we get through with this, if we have real war activity, bombings in this country, we will probably have a billion dollars in this undertaking instead of \$100,000,000.

I have submitted to the chairman a question, which I wish to offer now for the RECORD. It is prompted by the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] as to how the \$100,000,000 here provided for will be disposed of. My question is this: I understand that the medical and osteopathic general hospitals throughout the country are organizing emergency medical field units for civilian-defense purposes. A great amount of extra supplies and equipment will be needed and necessary for those hospitals carrying on that work, along with other hospitals not under the same supervision. Does this bill authorize funds to help defray the expenses of the added equipment and supplies for those hospitals?

Mr. MAY. It is my understanding that the bill authorizes a lump-sum appropriation of \$100,000,000, to be earmarked by the Appropriations Committee, which they usually do, specifying so much for certain purposes. But there is included in the estimate furnished by the civilian director for miscellaneous medical supplies, protective clothing, hospitalization, and so forth, \$13,069,927.41.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the figure I wanted to bring out. That is set out in the justification for the expenditure?

Mr. MAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And as far as the gentleman knows that applies to all hospitals organized for defense purposes?

Mr. MAY. It applies to all hospitals, regardless of where they are, of a civilian character. It does not make any difference whether they are osteopathic or what.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Further, in connection with the question you propounded to the chairman about where this money would be used to provide necessary things for hospitals, and so forth, I want to read from the hearings. Mr. LaGuardia was asked the question by Mr. THOMASON:

How many cities would that provide with the additional equipment you have in mind?

Mr. LaGuardia answered:

That would provide additional equipment for all cities of 2,500 and over, located within the 300-mile coastal strip of the continental United States.

In other words, the people who live outside that 300-mile zone would not ben-

efit under this bill if Mr. LaGuardia's plan is carried out.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman this question: In the concept included in the justification—in other words, the thirteen and one-half million dollars—does the gentleman understand that that concept of thirteen and one-half million dollars for hospitalization facilities, implements, purchases, and so forth, is limited to that 300-mile area?

Mr. HARNESS. That is my understanding of Mr. LaGuardia's testimony before the committee. That is why I asked the chairman of my committee the question at the beginning of this debate, whether any of these facilities and supplies provided for in this bill would be provided for the cities and towns outside the 300-mile zone.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Where the industrial centers are primarily located.

Mr. HARNESS. Yes; and these areas where the need exists.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman believe, bearing in mind that Mr. LaGuardia testified before the election, that the statements he made at that time would deter him from doing everything necessary to protect any city anywhere in the country and particularly a city like Detroit where they have all the national-defense industries of this country? Does the gentleman have that conception of Mr. LaGuardia or any other man who would administer this law?

Mr. HARNESS. I do not know what LaGuardia would do today. All I am doing is pointing out what he said in the hearings. He was limiting the \$100,000,000 to the area 300 miles inland from the coasts.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman will pardon a further interruption, I have in my hand an estimate which came to me this morning from the Civilian Defense organization totaling \$231,887,000, and broken down into many items, including auxiliary fire-fighting equipment, miscellaneous medical supplies, protective clothing, hospitalization, gas masks for civilians, and so forth.

Mr. HARNESS. But all within the 300-mile limit.

Mr. MAY. No; it does not say that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT].

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is hardly necessary for me to stand here and try to defend any one man, whether he be a Member of Congress in the past or present, especially Mr. LaGuardia. This legislation seems to have developed into a personal issue with many Members. I am the only Member on the committee from the city of New York, of which Mr. LaGuardia is mayor. Even though I opposed him in the last election, now, like every good Democrat, I am supporting him 100 percent in his mayoralty duties. I do feel, however, that the House bill which is before the committee this morning should provide for a head of civilian defense who can devote 100 percent of his time,

every minute of his time, to the Civilian Defense job. I daresay that any Member on the floor of this House would feel concerned if the mayor of his city were asked to do this job. The mayoralty of New York is a very big job, as some have said, perhaps the second most important job in the country; and the people of New York would like to see the mayoralty duties carried out by our duly elected mayor, the Honorable Fiorello LaGuardia, which he is qualified to do, as was testified at the last election.

I am sure we will not make this a personal issue. A great many things have taken place since we had the first hearings on this bill, so much so that now the job as Director of Civilian Defense should be considered as important as the commanding officer of any branch of our defense forces. Consequently the Office of Civilian Defense must be administered every minute of every day during the emergency period.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the logical department to handle this legislation is the War Department. One of the duties of the War Department is protection, and this legislation is designed to assist in the protection of the civilian population in case any hostile activity should take place in this Nation.

The War Department is equipped to take care of the procurement of the supplies necessary to this activity. They are better prepared than any other department of the Government to store these supplies, to issue them and control them when they have been issued. I certainly believe the War Department has the confidence of the people of the United States as much as any department has and perhaps to a greater extent than most.

It is undoubtedly contemplated that whoever administers this law will take advantage of local organizations such as mayors, sheriffs, fire departments, hospitals, and similar organizations. I believe they will also avail themselves of the volunteer services of such organizations as the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I certainly believe that at least the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars will have a little more confidence in the War Department than some other department which may get jurisdiction over this legislation if we do not place it in the War Department, the Department of Labor, for instance.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. In connection with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas, who raised the issue of loyal American Legion posts and fire departments possibly not being included, does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania suppose and know that any Assistant Secretary of War charged with the administration of this program, whether he be LaGuardia or anyone else, would naturally utilize these services?



Mr. FADDIS. Of course, they would. It would be the most natural and desirable thing in the world.

At the proper time I intend to offer an amendment to the House bill as presently reported to provide an Assistant Secretary of War for Civilian Defense subject to confirmation by the Senate, his term to expire 6 months after the termination of any war in which we are now engaged. His duty shall be the carrying into effect the provisions of this legislation. Certainly anyone can recognize the fact that now we are actually in war the administration of this legislation will not be a part-time job for any man.

Indeed, it would not be a part-time job for any hundred men, for regardless of whether or not the effects of this war actually touch our shores or not, all of the necessary preparations must be made. Certainly the Congress of the United States, which is charged with the defense of the Nation, cannot at this time ignore the fact that civilian defense is one of the most important parts of all defense. Certainly when we are providing for the defense of the civilian components of this Nation, we would indeed be remiss in our duty if we did not so institute a development of civilian defense that we will have a proper man in charge of it, a man in whom all of the people of this Nation will have confidence, a man who will have all of the time there is to devote to the administration of his duties. I am not saying anything about any one who is connected with it at the present time, but I am quite sure that I voice the sentiment of those within the hearing of my voice when I say we believe it is a full-time job for an able man.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Has any one given the House the benefit of what the experience has been in England under war conditions? How is it handled over there?

Mr. FADDIS. May I say that I am unable to tell the gentleman how it has been handled over there, but I am not willing to pattern everything we do in this Nation after the way the British have been doing it, because, after all, I think perhaps in the matter of civilian administration as well as in the matter of tactical administration we may be able to do it better than they have been doing it over there. I, at least, hope so.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. It has been suggested that you utilize the existing organizations like the fire department and so forth. Under the civilian defense can they not only utilize them but order them? What powers do you have? Are we going to have a lot of captains, lieutenants, and majors running around our communities?

Mr. FADDIS. I think not. Under the terms of the bill no powers of that kind are granted.

Mr. GIFFORD. I notice some in uniform now.

Mr. FADDIS. I feel sure any move that is made along that line will be to secure the voluntary services of these various organizations.

Mr. GIFFORD. As the appointees have been set up by the States at the present time, they have the authority to dress themselves up in uniforms and wear badges.

Mr. FADDIS. I do not know anything about the States. We have 48 of them.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does this civilian defense contemplate such authority as that? Are they going to order these things to be done?

Mr. FADDIS. Not under the terms of this legislation, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. I doubt that very much. I think when they visit my community they will take orders.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. It seems to me that the weakness in our national unity is the lack of public confidence in those who are running the war machine. Many people still feel that advantage is being taken of the emergency to further socialize America. If this is a war activity, and I presume the gentleman agrees it is a war activity—

Mr. FADDIS. I do.

Mr. COX. Then why should it not be carried on by somebody who knows something about war?

Mr. FADDIS. That is the way I believe it should be carried on.

Mr. COX. In other words it should be under the War Department. If we win this war we must win it not with banjo pickers or piccolo players, but with hard, practical, brave men. I believe the country is tremendously interested in the adoption of the measure which the gentleman now advocates because it is sensible. It is doing war business in a warlike manner.

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. GIFFORD. One more suggestion. I regret very much that people will say that we inject personalities into this discussion, but when we know the party who is going to carry on, we have a right to our opinion. I remind the gentleman of Mr. Henderson, and how we subjected Mr. Henderson to criticism. If they want this job, and we know who they are, we have a right to do that. I could eulogize the mayor of New York, I am sure, but I would rather let Jim Farley do that.

Mr. FADDIS. May I say in answer to the gentleman that I am not proceeding on the assumption that Mayor LaGuardia is to continue in his present position, neither am I proceeding on the assumption that he is not. I am merely trying to vest control of this legislation where the people will have as much confidence in it as we can possibly give them.

Mr. GIFFORD. He is already there.

Mr. FADDIS. We are trying to vest it in the Secretary of War.

Mr. GIFFORD. We are; yes.

Mr. FADDIS. By this legislation, so that is what we are discussing at the present time.

Mr. GIFFORD. That prospect pleases, but when we see the action of the other body and we know who the conferees will be, then I am not happy.

Mr. FADDIS. If we can get a proper expression from the members of this committee and the Members of the House, perhaps it will assist in encouraging the conferees to do what is right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, we are dealing here today with a stark and an urgent condition, not a theory, and I certainly hope we will not mistake the froth for the substance. The sole and entire purpose of this bill is to provide protection to the civilian population of our country against air raids which might be launched at any minute by our dastardly enemies.

Speaking subjectively and for my own district, the major portion of which lies along that great tidal estuary known as the East River of New York, extending from Long Island Sound to New York Harbor, we have there one of the most vulnerable areas in the entire United States. It is an area at which an air raid might be directed within the next 10 minutes, tonight, or next week.

This is no time to temporize and to engage in personalities as to who is best fitted to administer this law. This is the time to pass this act, and then let us work out the proper administration of it.

Mr. LaGuardia is not only my mayor, he is my personal friend. He is a man of great ability and of high integrity. But I believe it is beside the point now to consider whether Mr. LaGuardia can or will administer this law properly. My people—and I am sure I am speaking for the people of a great many other vulnerable areas—are crying for action. For example, in my district there is a great residential area known as Tudor City. Some of the finest apartment houses in the city of New York are located in Tudor City. It is a perfect target for an air raid. My constituents there are appealing to me, as their Congressman, to provide them with protection against these raids, not if they come, but when they come, because we must proceed on the assumption that New York City and other great port cities will have to suffer the ordeal and the horror of air raids—raids in which not only detonation, incendiary, and time bombs will fall, but raids in which every devilish device known to our enemies, including lethal gas, may be employed. It is our clear duty this afternoon to make it possible for the Government to furnish the people of all the Tudor Cities in the country with the equipment to protect their lives and their homes against this peril.

Let us not cavil. Let us not quibble. Let us act, and act quickly, on this all-important measure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, apparently, as far as this legislation is concerned, no Member has any objection to the broad purpose of the bill, namely, to acquire the necessary fire-fighting facilities, the necessary medical supplies and equipment, gas masks, and things of that kind that may be needed in this country in the event of an attack. One question, however, seems to have been raised, as to who is going to get this material.

The hearings on this bill were held last October. At that time it was simply an experimental program to place a few contracts, to get a few contractors in the habit of manufacturing the necessary equipment, and to supply those localities which would most likely be attacked first with the equipment that was first purchased.

Undoubtedly this program contemplates that ultimately, if the necessity seems apparent, every community throughout the Nation will be given its share of necessary equipment.

The big question that has arisen is whether or not the War Department should handle this function. Personally I am absolutely convinced that civilian defense is a civilian matter. It is a local matter; it is not a matter for the War Department to undertake.

If you do not believe that the War Department has a job on its hands at the present time, I advise you to go out to California, where I have been for the past 2 or 3 weeks, and ask to see what the War Department must do to provide adequate military protection for the west coast area. It is no simple problem to bring in troops, to provide antiaircraft protection, to bring in airplanes and provide air protection, and to bring in infantry and provide military protection against possible internal sabotage or rioting that may be provoked by the enemy. Providing defense from the air, from land, and from the sea is the military job, but when it comes down to fire protection, water protection, and medical aid for the civilian population, the War Department knows nothing about that and has nothing to do with it. If you throw this obligation into the hands of the War Department, you will clutter up that Department and give it a tremendous job about which it knows nothing, and you will be asking the Department to carry out that obligation which should rest upon the civilians.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Can the gentleman conceive of a division between an antiaircraft gun and a fire warden in the matter of responsibility and coordination?

Mr. COSTELLO. I certainly can see no combination of the two. Frankly, as far as the situation is concerned, I do not believe the fire wardens would be subject to any sort of control if the Army back in Washington had to dominate their activities. You would have to take out of the War Department any number of generals, colonels, majors, captains, all kinds of military personnel who have been trained to carry on warfare, and

make them handle civilian jobs. Certainly shooting an enemy airplane out of the sky differs very fundamentally from putting out a fire in the corner grocery.

This job can be handled by the civilian-defense coordinators in the various regions, whether they be the mayors or the sheriffs, or whoever they may be. It can be handled thoroughly and adequately by the civilian-defense organization.

Even though General Gregory last October made the statement that the War Department could easily handle this trifling sum of money, what does the War Department know about purchasing fire engines? Why ask them to go into that problem? Mayor LaGuardia and his committee have gone into the problem, they have studied the situation in London, they know what England has had to do, and they have drawn up a program. Now you are going to ask the War Department to duplicate that effort.

I say that the War Department should not be burdened with this obligation. It should not be put in their hands. If the War Department can successfully carry on this war on foreign battlefields, if they can successfully fight the Germans, the Italians, and the Japs, they will be doing the job for which they have been trained and which we have delegated to them. But we should not ask them to protect the civilians in every city, county, and State throughout this land.

This is an all-out war. It is no little job. It is a real effort on the part of every individual in this Nation. There is absolutely no reason why the mayor of your city and the fire department of your city and the water department, your county hospitals and medical staffs—yes, and every civilian himself—should not all assume their obligations. Let the civilian population handle this civilian job. Do not ask generals and colonels and majors who have been trained for warfare to handle some picayunish job in some small community. It is not their job. Do not waste hundreds of thousands of dollars of training by giving them a civilian job to handle.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I usually agree with the gentleman, but I cannot understand this. If it is necessary to win the war to put all the forces of the various nations under a unified command, why does not the same rule apply here to us? Why should not all the activities that have to do with the winning of the war and the defense of the civilian population be placed under one command?

Mr. COSTELLO. There is a very distinct cleavage between war activities and civilian activities. The War Department cannot provide infantry to protect every city in this land against sabotage. It cannot provide soldiers to fight forest fires or fires in defense plants. Those are normal civilian activities. They are normal peacetime activities. The most natural thing to do is to expand them on the same civilian basis on which they operate in peacetime, and expand them so they can take care of any undue emer-

gency that may arise because of wartime conditions. For a moment consider the Los Angeles County area. The mayor of the city of Los Angeles has under his control the largest fire-fighting equipment in that county. Who has control over that organization? Only the mayor. The Army has no right to order the fire department into any section of that city or county, but the mayor has. The sheriff of the county has the right to direct fire-fighting apparatus in the county, and so, likewise, these two individuals have control over the police personnel. They have control over the medical facilities that are available. They, and they alone, have the right to direct these forces. The Army has nothing to do with them unless you establish martial law. These are civilian activities. I say to you, do not confuse personalities in this problem with policy. Do not confuse civilian activities with military activities, but keep the two distinct if we are going to win this war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Director of Civilian Defense, appointed under authority of Executive Order No. 8757, dated May 20, 1941, to provide, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, facilities, supplies, and services to include research and development for the adequate protection of persons and property from bombing attacks in such localities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, as may be determined by said Director to be in need of, but unable to provide such protection: *Provided*, That such facilities and supplies may be loaned to civil authorities in accordance with said regulations: *Provided further*, That any department or agency of the Federal Government having equipment or supplies not required for its use may, subject to the approval of the Division of Procurement, Treasury Department, transfer the same without charge (notwithstanding the provisions of the act of December 20, 1928, 45 Stat. 1030) to the Director of Civilian Defense for the purpose herein authorized.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "sums", insert "not exceeding \$100,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Director of Civilian Defense, appointed under authority of Executive Order No. 8757, dated May 20, 1941", and insert "Secretary of War."

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, anything I say in opposition to this amendment would be largely a reiteration of what I said on the floor about an hour ago. I think we are faced with a serious and, perhaps, tragic situation which is very much larger than any individual or any personality that may have entered into the discussion of this legislation. Even if I did not feel that way I would try to be practical about it in view of the letter



I read here on the floor from the Secretary of War in which he says that the fighting forces of the Nation are now needed for purposes of war and, at least inferentially, says that the civilian population ought to be able to look after its purely civilian affairs. It seems to me that we are kind of butting our heads up against a stone wall to try to force on the War Department something they do not want and that they think can be better administered by civilians. So it seems to me to be an utterly useless and impractical thing.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have in my hand now a letter from the Arizona Farm Bureau Federation asking for the protection of certain dams, particularly Roosevelt Dam. Does this bill provide for that?

Mr. THOMASON. I understand that is included. I suppose you refer especially to Federal irrigation projects like the Elephant Butte Dam I have in my own district.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; Roosevelt and Elephant Butte and several others.

Mr. THOMASON. They are included, but that leads me to say to my friend from Arizona that to me it is absolutely ridiculous in time of war, when we are talking about fighting in every corner of the globe, to be taking regular soldiers and perhaps some officers out of the service to protect a dam anywhere when he ought to be in the field fighting, and when the civilians of that community could do the job about as well. Not only that, but it would serve to make the civilian population feel proud of the fact that they were doing their patriotic duty and had some mission to perform. All of us cannot carry guns, all of us cannot fight, some of us are sending our boys, but we have duties to perform in our local communities and, for heaven's sake, do not let us militarize the whole Nation.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman that we ought to get away from personalities in considering matters of control. In Arizona we regard the present mayor of New York City as one of our boys. We have confidence in him.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. No one is advocating the use of any captain or any lieutenant in the Army for this work. The work is going to be done by an Assistant Secretary of War for Civilian Defense and he is going to undertake the job of utilizing the local organizations, such as the police departments and the fire departments, in the various municipalities.

Mr. THOMASON. That is the reason I am for a civilian set-up. Let the people who want to do this work have an opportunity to do it. You can pass the gas houses and the bridges and the dams right around Washington here in the District of Columbia and you will see a lot of regular soldiers there protecting that property, perhaps, and I suppose it is safe to assume, under the command of some military officer in this district. Why in the name of heaven should not those boys be out with your boy fighting

for the preservation of the country and let some of these local civilians who want to do the job, and can do it just as well, be patrolling and guarding public utilities and doing other purely civilian work?

Mr. GIFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, can we not get rid of some of these soldiers over here at the House Office Building and put some civilians on duty there?

Mr. THOMASON. No; because that is purely military defense. That is the line of demarcation, I will say to my friend from Massachusetts, because those are machine guns or antiaircraft guns of the Coast Artillery, which are supposed to stop any enemy planes that might come over this city. That is not to be compared with the protection of a gas or electric-light plant or some dam or bridge in any part of the country. Those soldiers the gentleman mentions are there to fight.

Another thing is that these odd husky boys in the Army do not want to be guards. They want to get out and fight and be real soldiers. The mayors, sheriffs, and commanders of American Legion posts will do the home job if you will turn it over to them under some competent administrator.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman realize that under the amendment adopted by the committee the War Department would have the power to not employ a single civilian in these strategic positions?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, because I want to put it back where the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army, and the Secretary of War want it. That is the reason that I am opposed to it, because they are charged with the duty of protecting the country, and I am still of the opinion that the local communities can take care of their own affairs and that we can work out this matter of personalities. I want it understood that I am backing up the wishes and policy of the President and Secretary of War 100 percent.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the committee amendment. In my opinion, if the amendment is not adopted, as proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], a great deal of damage will be done to the bill. He seeks to strike out the words "the Secretary of War" in the committee amendment on page 2, in line 4.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], as I understand it, rose in opposition to the committee amendment. He did not submit an amendment to strike out the language, but he is opposing the committee amendment setting up the Secretary of War, and seeking to defeat that amendment.

Mr. FADDIS. I stand corrected. I want to state again what I said in the argument made in general debate when I spoke on the bill. I sincerely believe that for proper administration of the provi-

sions of this legislation it should be left to the Secretary of War. Certainly civilian defense has a great many things connected with it that are also connected with the military life of the Nation. Let us take a case of this kind. Let us suppose that for some reason it becomes necessary to evacuate a city; certainly that would be a military matter. Do we want to get into the same situation that France was in when they were evacuating their cities? Their civilian population blocked the roads and they were unable to move troops because of the exodus of the civilian population. We do not know yet what may come. We do not know to what we may be forced to resort in order to carry on the activities connected with this war. We hope we will not be forced to resort to any such measures; but if we do, we want to prepare for them.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. Does not the gentleman believe that with this civilian defense set up under a civilian director, necessarily there would be conflict between the War Department and the civilian director?

Mr. FADDIS. Why, of course. There would certainly be.

Mr. ELSTON. The civilian director, for example, would have the authority to organize a civil air patrol, and that civil air patrol would be bound to conflict with the military patrol, and they are doing that very thing now.

Mr. FADDIS. Yes. It would cause a great deal of duplication of effort.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee amendment will be adopted, and at a later time I shall offer an amendment which will set up an Assistant Secretary of War for National Defense.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I understand the War Department has gone on record in a letter to the chairman of the committee, in which the War Department takes the position that this war should be carried on by the present set-up of civilian defense. Has the gentleman any information that he can give us with regard to that?

Mr. FADDIS. It has already been given. I hope the members of the Committee of the Whole House will accept the committee amendment and leave the bill with its provisions in the hands of the Secretary of War.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do that primarily because of the reading of the letter from the Secretary of War, wherein he renounced the idea of military control over the O. C. D. I read cursorily the testimony given before the Committee on Military Affairs. I do not find a scintilla of evidence supporting the amendment out of the testimony of Gen. L. D. Gasser, of the United States Army, retired; of Col. P. X. English, executive officer, Chemical Warfare Service, War Department; of Brig. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, United States Army; or Maj. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, Quartermaster General, United States Army. They were the only witnesses,

aside from Mayor LaGuardia, who appeared before the Military Affairs Committee.

It strikes me, as I go over in memory the statements that have been made pro and con on this question today, that those who are opposed to the money going to Director of the Office of Civilian Defense primarily seem to be opposed to Mayor LaGuardia. Those who have contrary views are in favor of Mayor LaGuardia. Now, that is highly unfortunate. We should not legislate on the basis of any personality. We are derelict in our duties if we do this. Either the Office of Civilian Defense should have this money or it should not. It is not an issue growing out of any individual. If Mayor LaGuardia is not the proper person to head this organization, efforts should be made to get him to resign. Mayor LaGuardia is a very good friend of mine. He is an honorable gentleman and a very able administrator. He could do a splendid job as head of the Office of Civilian Defense and could properly handle this \$100,000,000, but he should not put us, his friends, in the position of taking a stand on whether we want him or whether we do not want him, when it comes to legislation of this character. He should be realistic enough not to put us in that position. All or most of his friends feel that he should not hold these two jobs, in reality three jobs; first, head of O. C. D.; second, mayor of New York City; and third, chairman of United States Conference of Mayors. No man in Christendom can hold jobs of this important character and do the jobs right. He might even have the strength of a Hercules and the wisdom of Athena—and the mayor seems even to approximate all such power—yet if the general public reacts against him, as is the case today concerning the mayor, he cannot get the best results for the office of Director of O. C. D.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I agree wholly with what the gentleman has said about basing this thing on personalities. That would be ridiculous. But does not the gentleman feel that since we have entered into a world-wide war and the President of the United States has set up this organization the Congress would be inconsistent if it does not go along and make the appropriation, subject to his appointment of any director he wants to appoint?

Mr. CELLER. I feel that the money should be appropriated and should be spent by the Office of Civilian Defense and not the War Department. This is a civilian-defense matter. It is called "civilian defense," not "military" defense. The experience of England should teach us that the civilian and not the military authorities should have the expenditure of this money. In England, air-raid shelters, hospital and medical supplies, black-outs, fire apparatus, gas masks, gas-proof clothing, water, gas, and power company regulations are all matters under the Office of Civilian Defense in the hands of the civilian authorities, and not the military authorities.

I do hope that the mayor will take wis-

dom from some of his friends and change this situation and will resign the job as Director of Civilian Defense. He should do that for the sake of his friends and not put his friends in this most embarrassing position. Assuredly there is plenty of defense work for him to do, plenty of places and positions within the gift of the Nation when and wherein he can expend his glorious talents and abilities.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. DEWEY. The gentleman has mentioned civilian defense, but I understand public funds will be used in support of civilian defense. Is it not usual that a Federal officer is employed to expend public funds, and not the officer of a city or one not engaged in the Government?

Mr. CELLER. I must respectfully differ with the gentleman, because the Director of Civilian Defense is a Federal officer. His is not a municipal office or a State office or a civilian office. He is a Federal officer beyond question, appointed under Federal authority, under Presidential Executive Order No. 8757, dated May 20, 1941.

Mr. DEWEY. Then does he hold two offices, a Federal appointive office, with salary, and a State office?

Mr. CELLER. That may be so, as to the dual office, but I do not understand there is any salary as Director of Office of Civilian Defense. His only salary, I believe, is as mayor.

Mr. DEWEY. And that is not permitted by law.

Mr. CELLER. That may be unfortunate, I have not checked on that phase of the matter, to wit, whether it is illegal for the mayor to hold a State and Federal office at one time. Frankly, in that connection, I do not know the effect of the Executive order appointing Mayor LaGuardia Director of Office of Civilian Defense.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, some emphasis has been laid upon the assertion this afternoon that civilian defense can be completely divorced from military defense. In view of what happens in modern wars I cannot accept that conclusion. The two are interlocked inevitably. You cannot separate them.

Consider the condition of a great city. Army patrol planes are patrolling the seas two or three hundred miles out. They spot an enemy aircraft carrier. They radio-telephone back to the headquarters on land—Army headquarters; central information. There sit civilians, oftentimes, to transmit these messages—to whom? To air wardens, civilians, to hospitals, to ambulance drivers, "Be on the alert."

You cannot separate the two functions or the two groups of people. Outside and below the Army personnel, which is technical very largely, are these civilians, splendid people, men and women, encouraged by the mayors of their cities, encouraged by the sheriffs of their counties, by those on the fire and police departments, who volunteer to stand ready

for duty, to be ready on a moment's notice, men and women who know their stations. They report for duty. They relieve each other from time to time. All is orderly. It strikes me that under a situation of that sort—and one could multiply the examples almost indefinitely—civilian defense and military defense are interlocked.

Now, how are you going to establish teamwork between the two? The strictly military side of the Army cannot do it all. Neither can the civilians in the cities do it all. They must be merged or put into a state of cooperation, largely through volunteer effort. I cannot picture this country being militarized, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] has said, if the War Department takes over the general management of this thing. Combat troops are not going to parade our streets. Young lieutenants and captains are not going to do this duty. These same civilian volunteers are going to do it, but they are going to do it in cooperation with the Army that mans the signal stations, that flies these planes, runs the interceptor devices, gathers the alarms, and spreads them through the cities, through the civilian volunteers. You cannot trust it to the Governor of a certain State, much as that Governor will work to make civilian defense in his State effective.

The State of New Jersey, for example, by legislative enactment, has established a civilian defense commission authorized by statute to do certain things and to have certain powers in the State of New Jersey. But what good can they do in the case of a black-out alarm in New York City when you remember that Jersey City is right across the river from New York and is a part of the metropolitan area and part of the target? You have got to see to it that those communities cooperate, that they are coordinated in their civilian defense; and the only way to do it is to have a superior managing power. I do not anticipate that this will take any such large personnel from the War Department. You know and I know, and I know positively that there are many officers today on the retired list completely competent to man a small staff here in Washington to work out the coordination between the communities, the States, and the cities. There are officers in the Army today who have passed the age-in-grade limit and for whom the War Department is trying to find good administrative places.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman know of any reason or any law that would prevent the Civilian Director, whoever he may be, from calling on these retired Army officers for their voluntary service?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is nothing to prevent his calling on them, but he has no power to call on them. They are in the Army even though retired. The Army could select the best men to do this job, and not leave it to a civilian. The War Department will comb over its list of officers, mostly of middle age, and select the men who can do this thing at New York, at Baltimore, at Boston, Phila-



delphia, Chicago, San Francisco, or any other place; and the man in San Francisco will work under General DeWitt and will cooperate with the mayor of San Francisco and the chief of police.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that under the present set-up retired officers of the Regular Army are being called in? I have very specially in mind a great military man in my judgment, General Gasser, former Chief of Personnel of the War Department. He is the first assistant to Mr. LaGuardia in this office. Does not this therefore prove that it is not necessary to turn it over to the Army in order to get the service of these retired officers and these veterans?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot conceive it to be a part of sound military policy to leave it to a civilian organization to call Army officers to duty. They should be called to duty by the Army and not on the basis of personal acquaintance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, several Members are on their feet seeking recognition. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment conclude in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair has made a list of those who have indicated a desire to speak on this amendment and will endeavor to recognize them in turn.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, in the light of the letter that was received from the Secretary of War, and in light of the facts which have occurred in the last few days, it is my judgment that this matter should be handled through the civilian defense set-up. I have in mind, Mr. Chairman, this: The Army normally operates in times of emergency in military areas by means of martial law. The State and municipal governments operate by use of civil law. These two bodies of law have been developed and worked out and have come down to us through hundreds of years.

Here is a proposition which covers the entire Nation. The need for these services may be just as acute in the geographical center of the United States, for instance, St. Louis, as on the Atlantic, the Pacific, or the Gulf coast. The need may develop at a time when a locality is under attack from an Axis Power or it may develop at a time when there is no such attack. The need for such services may continue long after the attack has occurred, long after, for instance, bombers have dropped their bombs upon a city and have disrupted normal civil functions. The need for the services of civilian defense may continue for weeks and months. For instance, the need of protecting and rebuilding or reconstructing the utilities of a city would continue until the repairs are completed and the functions are reestablished. In the light

therefore, of the fact that the need for these services may occur thousands of miles away from the military areas, and may continue long after the actual attack ceases, it should be left in the hands of civil authorities. The Civilian Defense contemplates the use of civil law in carrying out its orders rather than military law. This is in fact an effort to continue the use of civil functions, normal civil functions, of the communities as far as possible, even in time of a world war; and it is my opinion that it is far preferable to continue this as a civil set-up rather than a military one. The Secretary of War himself says he would rather not have this additional authority and responsibility. He feels this work can be properly handled by the civil set-up which is contemplated under the present arrangement under which we have been operating.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman mentioned the fact that this applies all over the country and that there are many civil duties involved. Does not the gentleman feel that our Selective Service Act, which operates almost entirely through civilians on civilians and is subject to civil law until a man is inducted, is wisely under the Army and the War Department?

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman is in error. It is not under the Army or the War Department. It is set up as a civilian set-up.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. But there are officers in charge of it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have been wondering just where the Office of Civilian Defense was placed in the Government of the United States, so I referred to the well-known Congressional Directory, the latest edition thereof, a volume sometimes facetiously referred to as the family Bible. I find that under the Executive Office of the President there is the Liaison Office for Personnel Management, Council of National Defense, Office for Emergency Management, Coordinator of Information, Economic Defense Board, Bureau of the Budget, National Resources Planning Board, and Office of Government Reports.

Under the Office for Emergency Management, headed by Wayne Coye and a number of assistants and division chiefs, comes 13 other divisions, including Office of Civilian Defense. In addition to the Office of Civilian Defense, under the heading of Office for Emergency Management, there are the following: Defense Communications Board, Office of Facts and Figures, Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, Division of Defense Housing Coordination, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, National Defense Mediation Board, Office of Price Administration, Office of Production Management, Supply Priorities and Allocations Board, Office of

Scientific Research and Development, and Transportation Division.

The Office of Civilian Defense has a number of officials. There is the Director, Fiorello H. LaGuardia, and an Acting Deputy Director, who, I presume, is the man who sits in the office and does the office work, Mr. T. Semmes Walmsley. There is a Deputy Director in Charge of Operations, Mr. Corrington Gill. There is the Assistant Director in Charge of Participation, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. There is an Assistant Director, Eloise Davison, and Acting Assistant Director, Mr. S. Howard Evans.

The Office of Civilian Defense, according to this volume, is located in the Dupont Circle Apartments, phone Republic 5050.

I think that completes the picture of the set-up. The Office of Civilian Defense comes under the Office for Emergency Management which is an executive agency directly under the President.

May I say, as one civilian to 434 others here, that as there must be a civilian defense I would like to see it come under the direction of somebody who knows the defense business from A to Izzard, and who has had long experience in the actual art of defense. If we want a man who has had long experience with local governmental affairs and who can be said to be nonpolitical—of course, I assume that Mr. LaGuardia, of New York is not available for full-time duty in this matter—there are a number of perfectly good city managers and county managers throughout the country who carry Army titles as high as colonel or general. I can refer to one from my own county, Col. Wayne Allen, a good soldier, who understands management of civilian matters very well. He is quite capable and would be a good man for this position, but he is only one of many.

Under the committee amendment, which would substitute the Secretary of War for the Office of Civilian Defense, I have no conception that the Secretary of War will put in a lot of captains, sergeants, corporals, and soldiers to operate the civilian defense. With all due respect to my colleagues who feel otherwise about it, I think that that would be unwise procedure and anybody who would be Assistant Secretary of War in charge of civilian defense would surely realize that. All this Assistant Secretary is supposed to do is to coordinate the civilian defense. He is not expected to order them to buy fire equipment or to police bridges or drain pipes or anything else, nor is he expected to give orders to police or fire departments. His duties would be the same as those now assigned to the Office of Civilian Defense.

Under the amendment here proposed and the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], it would be possible to use the procurement facilities of the War Department for purchasing gas masks for distribution to civilian agencies and civilians. That same thing would be true for other defense items.

Furthermore, under the War Department it would be possible to call back to duty a number of retired officers, among

them those who may have some slight physical disability which might preclude them from field service but which does not actually disable them. The Secretary of War can call these men back to active duty and assign them to civilian defense. He could also better utilize the organizations of veterans of the last war who are now so anxious to be doing something for the defense of their country. Civilian defense means just what it says. It doesn't mean a pink tea. It is serious business and people who know something about it should be responsible for it.

I am in favor of the committee amendment, and will favor the Faddis amendment when presented.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT].

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to make three simple points against the committee amendment. First, let me dwell for a moment on something that we all know. I happen to know it first-hand because I served for some years in the administrative branch of the Government. It is very, very rare indeed to find any Government department either voluntarily relinquishing power or refusing power when it is offered to it. In this case, however, even though the committee believed that this function should be in the War Department, the Secretary of War and the War Department have said, "No, we do not want this function. It should be performed by civilians."

Under the circumstances, with full knowledge of how usually every department welcomes new authority, it seems to me that that view of the Secretary of War should have very great, if not controlling, weight in this body.

Second, just to reiterate a point that has been made before. It is true that the Office of Civilian Defense's chief job is to protect civilians in their homes from the effects of air raids, and the chief contacts of such an office must be with local governments and local bodies of volunteer civilians. The job is a civilian function.

The gentleman from Ohio asked a question a little while ago, "Is not the draft a civilian function?" The answer to that is, "Yes, it does deal with civilians, and it is in a civilian agency, even though the man heading it may have a military title."

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. It is a civilian agency that inducts into the service of the Army of the United States the men needed for fighting purposes.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Louisiana is right. The contact between civilian and army is at least as close there, if not closer, than it would be in connection with civilian defense.

Third, I just want to comment, if I may have the temerity to do so, about the very interesting speech by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. He said that the functions of the military and

civilian bodies in a matter of this sort were inevitably inseparable. I merely comment there that we must as a matter of course rely largely upon English experience for our development of air-raid precautions. They have had that experience, they have learned through experience, and they are doing a very effective job of protecting their civilians now. In England, Air Raid Precautions, the equivalent of our Office of Civilian Defense, is a civilian agency.

Mr. Chairman, for those three reasons I hope very much that this committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that the present Office of Civilian Defense was created by Executive order of the President?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I believe so.

Mr. KEEFE. All this bill does is name the Secretary of War to be Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, subject to the rules and regulations the President may prescribe. Is it not fair to assume, therefore, that the rules heretofore laid down by the President prescribing the civil character of the present organization, and under which the organization now functions, will continue in force and be reestablished by the President, and that this organization will remain purely civil in character, although having as its active head the Secretary of War? Is that a fair question?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. It is a fair question, and anyone can assume anything he wishes, but I would prefer not to leave it to chance.

Mr. MAY rose.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman from Kentucky wish me to yield?

Mr. MAY. May I just observe, if the gentleman will permit, in answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin, that the effect of the amendment, then, is simply to fire one man and appoint another?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman does not see fit to answer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

I dislike to take issue with the gentleman who has just preceded me but I must say I am fully in accord with the position taken by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], in that I fail to see how civil defense and military defense must not of necessity be interlocked at all times. After all, the Army is out to protect the civilians. As the gentleman from New York so ably pointed out, in the event of an air raid they will be the first to give the alert signal and to put the civilian population on notice to take cover and prepare for civilian self-defense, working through volunteer and even professional civilian workers.

The gentleman from Texas and many other speakers today have been stressing the patriotic fervor with which the volunteer workers have attacked their jobs. That is very true. I have recently had personal contact with many who are volunteering their services. Despite their enthusiasm, I find there is a very great deal of chaos and confusion presently existing in the civilian-defense organization due to the fact that professionals have not been employed to coordinate their efforts with those of the military. And trained professionals have not been utilized to properly instruct them in their duties.

I think this matter should properly be put under the Secretary of War and, as the gentleman from New York said, we should even call back many of the hundreds or thousands of ex-Army officers who are writing your office and mine asking what they can do to serve the country in its hour of crisis.

All these patriots who are volunteering their services for civilian defense deserve the highest credit, but let me point out that not all in the Office of Civilian Defense are volunteers or perhaps quite as patriotically inclined. Let me read you an article I clipped from a Cleveland paper dated, I believe, December 30 last. This is typical of partisan political activity going on in a great many sections of the United States under the Office of Civilian Defense.

#### CARR QUILTS CITY JOB FOR UNITED STATES POST

Charles Carr, Democratic leader in ward 17, today resigned the \$3,100 assistant police prosecutorship he took December 15 to accept a job with the Federal Civilian Defense Administration at \$4,500 a year.

Carr, who lost the councilmanic race last fall in ward 17 by 600 votes to Councilman William O. Walker, notified Law Director Thomas A. Burke, Jr., of his new job, and his resignation was accepted.

The article further states Carr will perform his duties in Columbus, the State capital.

I should certainly like to have somebody from Cleveland or from Ohio who knows that gentleman explain to the House just what his specific qualifications are for this important \$400-a-month job in the Office of Civilian Defense organization.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Against whom is it proposed that this agency defend us; against civilian attack or against a hostile military attack?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I assume it is to protect the civilians of this Nation against hostile military attack.

Mr. JENNINGS. Does anybody think for 1 minute that a civilian, even though that civilian may be a woman, is better qualified to defend us against military attack than a military man would be?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I certainly think the question answers itself. Obviously this calls for a tremendous amount of military organization, supplemented by volunteer civilian workers in every community in this land. Partisan



politics should play no part in the vital question of civilian defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment. Throughout this debate the proponents of the committee amendment, it seems to me, have overlooked the work that has already been done by the Office of Civilian Defense. The nature of that work has not been fully described here.

Civilian defense as we know it is entirely separate and distinct from military defense against attack. Civilian defense involves the protection of water mains, gas mains, lighting systems, and hospitals; in other words, it is a carrying out on a more extensive and strenuous basis during wartime of the already existing civil municipal functions. Because of the requirements of the war, it is necessary to have volunteers to do this work of a civilian and municipal nature and to carry on municipal functions. For that purpose, and for that purpose alone, there have been enrolled throughout the United States 5,245,338 volunteers as of December 31. Six hundred and fifty-seven thousand eight hundred and thirty-seven have been enrolled as air-raid wardens, 272,491 have been enrolled as auxiliary firemen, 179,731 have been enrolled as auxiliary police, 295,840 have been enrolled in auxiliary medical units, 167,138 have been enrolled in other protective capacities, and 417,504 have been enrolled in community activities, including child care, war relief, food conservation, and so forth.

Now, with all due respect to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], I do not see just how these functions are necessarily a part of the actual military defense against attack. Since they are of a civil character and since this is an extension of municipal town and county functions, then, necessarily, there must be a separate set-up, and the Office of Civilian Defense does nothing else but carry out the civilian functions of a municipality, town, or county, but on a more extensive scale, with more people involved as a result of the needs raised by the war.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. MAY. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if he knows how many policemen and firemen there are in the city of New York; and if they were all fired and replaced by military men, how many men it would take?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am sorry I am not in a position to answer that question.

Mr. ANDREWS. I will be glad to answer that question. None of them would be fired.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. Since child care and nutrition and food conservation are a part of this work, does not the gentleman think some old bachelor, a retired army officer, would be better prepared to look after the babies than the organizations of mothers in a city?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will tell the gentleman that I do not see much connection between a brass hat and a cradle.

May I also add one other thing. If you turn this thing over to the War Department all of a sudden, making a sudden change, just what is going to happen to this set-up, a set-up composed now of 7,084 city and county defense councils and over 5,000,000 volunteers who are being trained, who meet almost every night, and have been meeting in the various localities throughout the Nation receiving instructions and doing an excellent job? How many fighting men would you need to supervise and carry out this large and country-wide program? Very correctly, the War Department insists that this task be performed by the existing civilian defense set-up. I submit that in view of this position of the War Department, as well as the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, who insists that this work be carried on by a separate organization such as the Office of Civilian Defense, we are taking too much of a gamble with the safety of the citizens of the various communities of this country by making this switch over to the War Department.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time not particularly to discuss the amendment, but to call certain conditions to the attention of Members of the House, especially those who live in localities that have large industrial plants that are actively engaged in defense production.

I have observed that a distinguished Member of the Congress at the other end of the Capitol spoke on this subject a week or 10 days ago in regard to what is being done for the protection of Pittsburgh, which he defined as the very heart of the steel industry. Without being at all provincial, may I call attention to the fact that Schenectady, N. Y., is my home town. Some people have difficulty in spelling it and think it is an Indian chief's name, but it is not. It is a city of one hundred-and-odd thousand real Americans, and the General Electric Co. is located there, which is making nearly every type of war-defense material, including turbines for naval vessels. We have there also the American Locomotive Works, which is turning out regular tank production at the present time in addition to locomotives. Two miles away is the great United States Army warehouse depot, where millions of dollars worth of Army material is stored for current and future use.

Recently I attended a meeting where there was a representative of Civilian Defense, and after he got through I talked with him about this matter and

asked him if anything was being done to protect these industrial centers in view of the considerable stress that is being placed upon production at this moment. He said that was certainly not one of their functions, that it should be referred to the War Department. It seemed to me that all the advice he gave us as to what to do as a result of a bombing raid was very fine and helpful. He told us that the industrial plants had been advised by printed circulars and otherwise what they were to do as to building protective walls between machines and windows, and advising them what to do otherwise, and I said "That would be too late; it seems to me in these big industrial centers we ought to have a further development of local air fields and have them equipped with some pursuit planes and some anti-aircraft guns and not wait until the bombing commenced before we did anything about it."

I understand that in the President's message, as I read it, there is a request for some 20,000 anti-aircraft guns. It may be that these are requested in view of the present emergency, and, perhaps, some of them are going to be allocated for the purpose of industrial plant defense. It seems to me there is an especial need of pursuit planes in local air fields in order to give some degree of security to the immense centralized defense production plants that there are in the country. Only a few miles away we have the great Watervliet Arsenal, and I presume that there are a hundred Members in the House who have in their districts great industrial centers where this defense production is going on.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I call the gentleman's attention to a statement made by the Civilian Director on page 4 of the hearings. After he had spoken about New York and coastal cities within a range of 300 miles, he made this statement:

Then we have cities of similar size within the key defense area, cities like Cleveland, and cities like Detroit, where they have what we call sensitive points that make attractive targets for attacks

Mr. CROWTHER. I thank the chairman for his contribution, and I hope that if it is not within the scope of civilian-defense authorities that the War Department and its military authorities will give immediate consideration to a program that will give a sufficient degree of protection and a feeling of security to those industrial concerns that are so vitally interested in our mass production for defense.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am in rather a close strait jacket in this matter, in view of the fact that our committee by a single vote of one reports this amendment. I am not taking a stand one way or the other upon it, but I do want to call attention to the apparent absurdity of the procedure.

The only effect that this amendment has is to throw out of office a civilian director appointed by the Chief Executive of this country under an Executive order and require the appointment of another.

It may be that if you name under the amendment that is to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], as I understand it, an additional Assistant Secretary of War, that that Assistant Secretary of War might turn around and appoint the same Civilian Director. If he did appoint a different person to the position of Civilian Director, this appropriation made by the War Department would not go through the Civilian Director.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. As a matter of fact, the mayor of New York, who is a veteran of the World War, was an officer assigned to the Air Corps, and if the President, under the terms of the committee amendment, if it should become law, so desired, he could still have the mayor of New York as Director. There is nothing in the world to prevent the President from appointing Mr. LaGuardia as an officer and placing him in charge of these activities. I am considering this bill not from the standpoint of LaGuardia or anyone else other than the Commander in Chief of our armed forces. We have heard much about cooperation and unity. Where is the cooperation and unity now?

Mr. MAY. Nothing in the world, but let me say that when we first reported this bill, it was some time before a declaration of war. It was in October. We have made three declarations of war since that time. Then, right on the heels of the consideration of the matter the committee was informed by the Secretary of War that he had no desire to take over this endeavor, and undoubtedly when the President told us a few days ago as Commander in Chief of our armed forces, that we are to go to any part of the world, we certainly should not do anything to cause the Secretary of War to take from his own people and have them take the place of civilians, who have volunteered. If the War Department has to do it, it will cost two or three times as much as it will cost in the other way, because every one, including the Director, is a volunteer, without compensation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the second committee amendment, which, without objection, the Clerk will again report.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the second committee amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Are we now voting to retain in the bill the committee amendment as reported by the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the committee as now in the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. Then a vote of yea is to sustain the bill as it comes from the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. A vote of aye would be in favor of the committee amendment. The committee amendment is to strike out lines 5 and 6 and insert the words "Secretary of War." That is the way in which the bill came from the committee,

with the words "Secretary of War" in the bill, so that a vote of aye would have the effect of leaving the bill in the form it came from the committee.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, the result would be that if a member wants to vote to turn the entire matter over to the Secretary of War he votes aye, and if he wants civilian defense he would vote no.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMASON) there were—ayes 110, noes 58.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 4, after the word "by", strike out "said Director" and insert "the Secretary of War."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, in line 13, after the word "the", strike out "Director of Civilian Defense" and insert "the Secretary of War."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Has all of section 1 been read?

The CHAIRMAN. It has.

Mr. MAY. Then, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 2, line 2, after the word "attacks", insert the words "sabotage or other war hazards."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make this explanation of that amendment: There is some question about it being confined only to bombing, and if we protect anybody we should protect them for every purpose. That is all there is to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FADDIS: On page 2, after the period in line 15, insert "To aid the Secretary of War in the performance of his duties under this act and to perform such other functions relating to civilian defense as the Secretary of War may direct, there shall be an additional Assistant Secretary of War who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per annum. Upon the expiration of 6 months after the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, the office of Assistant Secretary of War herein created is abolished."

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, now that the committee has decided to leave the administration of this matter in the hands of the War Department, where it belongs, I believe, in justice to the Nation and in justice to the Secretary of War, an additional Assistant Secretary of War should be created to administer the provisions of this legislation.

The duties in connection with this legislation will be rather extensive. A great deal of property will necessarily have to be procured and distributed in connection with the provisions of the legislation. Someone will have to be accountable for it. Someone will have to be responsible for it. I therefore believe that because of the great number of duties of the Secretary of War at the present time we should create a temporary Assistant Secretary of War for the purpose of administering this legislation.

I call the attention of the members of this committee to the fact that this amendment provides for the automatic termination of this office whenever there is no longer any necessity for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there anything in the amendment which, if adopted, would prevent the mayor of a great city being appointed to that office and still hold the office of mayor?

Mr. FADDIS. No; there is not. I know of no way to provide against that, and am not aiming this amendment at anyone. However, it has been made subject to the confirmation of the Senate, and I believe that is as far as we can go.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Will your amendment make the Director of Civilian Defense a full-time job?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. There is no question about that?

Mr. FADDIS. There is no question about that. He would be an Assistant Secretary of War for Civilian Defense.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And it would be a full-time job?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And it could not be held by someone holding a State job?

Mr. FADDIS. Well, yes; it could, if they wanted to; but I provide for confirmation by the Senate, and I am very confident that the Senate, at least, would not allow any abuse of it in that respect. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could recall the language of some of the speeches made on this floor, especially by my friends on the Republican side, in days gone by when there would be a bill here to provide for an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture or Interior or something of the sort.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. In just a moment. But it just seems now that this feeling against our old friend and colleague, Mr. LaGuardia, is such, as indicated by the



question of the gentleman from Michigan to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the thing to do is to make sure that we tell the Commander in Chief of our armed forces who shall run this job.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was not here when Mr. LaGuardia was here, but I do know that you have criticized us for being partisan in that we did not support your measures. Now, when we go along, are you still criticizing us for following you?

Mr. THOMASON. I suspect the gentleman's motives when he is so enthusiastic about creating a new office that nobody has asked for. We have not heard a single word from my friend from Pennsylvania as to what duties are to be performed by this new Assistant Secretary of War, yet anybody of intelligence, like my friend from Pennsylvania, ought to know that that office, if created, is not going to be abolished 6 months after war is over.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. The language of the amendment reads that he is to perform such other functions relative to civilian defense as the Secretary of War may direct; and the amendment further provides an automatic termination of the office 6 months after the war is over.

Mr. THOMASON. As some gentleman said just a few moments ago, the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, if he wanted to appoint Mr. LaGuardia to the job, could do it; but I repeat what I said earlier in the day that in this terrible crisis I am trying to think of principles and results rather than personalities. In order to be consistent I go back to my original proposition that the President of the United States has not said he wants another Assistant Secretary of War. The Secretary of War who is charged with the duty of fighting and winning this war has said in a written letter that he does not want this job and this duty, and he has not asked for any Assistant Secretary. Now to go along without a word from the Secretary of War, without a word from the President of the United States and willy nilly create a new job of Assistant Secretary of War that has not been asked for and pay the incumbent \$10,000 a year, I say is carrying your prejudice too far.

I should like in this connection to say that if the Secretary of War in the interest of national defense and winning this war advises the Committee on Military Affairs or any Member of this House that he needs and wants an Assistant Secretary of War, I am willing to give it to him, but simply to take another slap at Mr. LaGuardia a distinguished American, a man who has ability, character, and courage of a high order—I say it is further than I am willing to go. I believe in Mr. LaGuardia and am his friend. I believe in him enough to feel sure he will resign one of his jobs if either he or the President thinks it best for the winning of the war.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Surely the gentleman does not mean to characterize Congress as acting willy-nilly because perchance it takes some action which has not been asked of it?

Mr. THOMASON. No; I will take issue with my good friend from Tennessee to this extent, that in this Congress when it comes to the question of national defense and winning this war, the Commander in Chief and the Secretary of War will have my loyal and active support in everything they want or recommend, that will further their plans and get results.

Mr. GORE. But the gentleman says the Congress acts willy-nilly when it goes along and does something it is not asked to do.

Mr. THOMASON. I have said, I say again, and stand by what I say, and that is when the Secretary of War in an official letter over his signature says he does not want to use the Army to do all this civilian work, when he says: "For heaven's sake, let the civilians in the respective communities do it," then I am going to follow him. I am not going to let any prejudice or dislike for individuals change my judgment or votes in that regard.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take my 5 minutes.

The gentleman from Texas has referred to the matter of being consistent. I might remind the gentleman from Texas that the House by a vote of 3 to 1 has voted to place this activity under the War Department. If we are going to be consistent we must have an Assistant Secretary of War for civilian defense. I say let the President appoint Mr. LaGuardia as Assistant Secretary, if he wants to. I will be satisfied with that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wish to beg of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] not to discourage those of us who are trying to support the administration, by charging us with partisanship when we vote for an amendment introduced by a Democrat, supported by a large number of influential Democrats. It is true that as a party we have been consistent in our opposition to the creation of new departments, agencies, and offices, that, on the ground of economy. We have, just as consistently, however, voted for appropriations for national defense and since the declaration of war, so far as I know, not a single Republican has voted against any appropriation designed to aid in the war effort. Now just because this bill creates a new office and practically all of the Republicans support it, you charge us with opposition to the President and with partisanship; either forgetting or ignoring the fact that the new office, that of Under Secretary of War, will be filled by a Democrat, by a Democrat selected

by the President and who will act in the future under his orders.

Why not be fair with us and when we try to go along, not jump on us? It is sure discouraging to have our every action, no matter how patriotic, challenged as political even though that action is in accord with that of a large number of your own party members. Why, every time that we try to assist, do you give us a kick?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time in order to see if I can straighten out, in my own mind at least, one or two perplexing problems in connection with this particular amendment. I would like the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. It is a fact, is it not, that this entire set-up of civilian defense was created by the President of the United States by Executive order?

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. And the President of the United States by that Executive order appointed the Director of Civilian Defense and prescribed his duties. The only duties that the Director is now carrying out presumably are the duties prescribed in the Executive order creating the position; is that correct?

Mr. MAY. The Executive order, as I understand it, created the position, appointed the Director and defined his duties by regulation.

Mr. KEEFE. I have not heard anybody read the duties of this Director as prescribed in the Executive order, and, upon inquiry of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I am informed he does not have a copy of that Executive order here on the floor this afternoon. If I understand anything about this problem at all, it is that the President of the United States, when this legislation is passed in its present form, regardless of the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, will still provide the regulations and the direction for the administration of this Office of Civilian Defense.

We have by this amendment provided that the Secretary of War shall provide "under such regulations as the President may prescribe," facilities, supplies, and so forth, to do what? To carry out the purposes and the objectives set forth in the Executive order creating this agency of civilian defense. It certainly goes without saying that if the President has the right to create this agency and has the right to specify what the agency shall do and to prescribe its duties and its functions, then when we authorize an appropriation of \$100,000,000 it makes little difference what we say here because the President by his regulations still runs this show, and make no mistake about that.

It seems to me that when we create another office of Assistant Secretary of War, we are just creating an office that may have some repercussions that we do not now know about. This man is to do the work of the Director of Civilian Defense and the President will see that the man he wants is put in there. If that man is Mr. LaGuardia, it will be Mr. LaGuardia, and the Secretary of War will simply be the over-guiding head.

This organization will continue to function with its civil personnel, in my opinion, exactly as it is doing today, because if that is what the President wants that is what the President can do under the authority that he now has under existing law. So why are we wasting all this time, when, as a matter of fact, he is the Commander in Chief, and can, and no doubt will, appoint whom he pleases and keep him under the very terms of this law that we have before us today? I cannot support this amendment to create another unnecessary job, although I was pleased to support the committee amendments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, are the supporters of the ripper bill attempting here today to cooperate with the Commander in Chief? You have been asked by a close division of the Military Affairs Committee, the majority of which was dominated by the Republicans when the vote was taken, to pass your first ripper bill, and put a man out of office whom the President has chosen as Director of Civilian Defense. In the World War we did not use anything such as proposed here. In Britain it has been pointed out to you they did not use it then and are not using it now. Britain's civilian-defense program is not under the Army.

In every little community the question of civilian defense is of a different nature. The men in these communities know best how to handle the situation better than any imported brass hat. Whenever you call on the people and they come together, they will do something patriotic and get credit for it. The good women of the town and all the people will walk their legs off canvassing or doing something, and they will do it all on a voluntary basis. But when you point out to that town what they have to do, you have murdered this cooperative spirit. The feeling is, "I feel I am doing it because I am told to do so."

You say that there is no way to separate the work. This military man comes down there under orders which he must obey, which are Army orders, to tell people not subject to his jurisdiction, operating under civil law, to do something. When you do that there is going to be very poor cooperation. He will get criticism from that community the first mistake or two he makes.

I can think of nothing more destructive and one which will do more to kill off the fine spirit in various places, from the small hamlet to the big city, than that. These people have been cooperating in this work. They have had varied experience. Why, this civilian defense program is not all an air raid. It concerns things that a military officer with long life in the Army knows no more about than a goose. He is no more fitted to take charge of some of those things in these towns and cities than a man who came off the farm is to undertake to take the officer's place back in front of the Army. It is a different proposition entirely. It is one for local people, and it is a reflection on their ability.

The present Civilian Director, Mayor LaGuardia, may or may not be the proper person to direct, but that is a matter for the Commander in Chief.

I am not going to start off here by going back to the old tactics. Some of my Democratic friends are standing here and falling for the same old bunk of obstructionists that they are standing in line here for the first ripper bill. It is a pitiable spectacle and a damnable shame on the Democrats for joining hands with the men who only a few days ago attempted to strangle every defense effort and everything else. And here you are goose-stepping down the line again with those boys leading the procession for your first ripper bill. May God save the country and the President. We had been assured that sniping was over, but we see that it is not.

You are asked to vote for something which neither the President, the Secretary of War, the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, nor the floor leader wants. To satisfy whom and what? Is there a request from any State, county, or city official of the land wanting the Army to usurp civil functions?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMASON) there were—ayes 103, noes 73.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. FADDIS and Mr. MAY to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 113, noes 85.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person to wear a uniform, insignia, arm band, or other distinctive article prescribed by the Director of Civilian Defense except in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the authority of section 1 hereof. Any person found guilty of violating the provisions contained in this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$100 or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out lines 16 to 23, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person to wear an insignia, arm band, or other distinctive article prescribed by the Secretary of War except in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the authority of section 1 hereof: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of War, or any person or employee acting under him by authority of this act, or in pursuance of the regulations prescribed thereunder to interfere with or usurp any of the rights or duties of any local district, municipal, county, or State official.

"Any person found guilty of violating the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$100 or imprisoned for not more than 30 days, or both."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry

amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BARNES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5727) to provide protection of persons and property from bombing attacks in the United States, its Territories and possessions, to authorize the procurement of materials and supplies, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the committee amendment appearing in lines 5, 6, and 7 on page 1, and I also demand a separate vote on the so-called Faddis amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments relating to the substitution of the Secretary of War for the Director of Civilian Defense appear not only on lines 5, 6, and 7 on page 1, but also in lines 4 and 13 and 14 in page 2. I therefore ask unanimous consent that these amendments may be considered en bloc.

I also demand a separate vote on the Faddis amendment, which immediately follows section 1 in the bill as printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands a separate vote on the amendments substituting the Secretary of War for the Director of Civilian Defense. There are three such amendments and the gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the amendments be voted on en bloc. The gentleman also demands a separate vote on the Faddis amendment. Does the gentleman desire that the Faddis amendment be voted on with the other amendments?

Mr. THOMASON. No, Mr. Speaker; I demand a separate vote on that amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question is on the amendments on which a separate vote has not been demanded.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendments on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, beginning in line 5, strike out "Director of Civilian Defense, appointed under authority of Executive Order No. 8757, dated May 20, 1941" and insert "Secretary of War."

On page 2, in line 4, strike out "said Director" and insert "the Secretary of War."



On page 2, in line 13, strike out "Director of Civilian Defense" and insert "the Secretary of War."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 109, noes 82.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 187, nays 169, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 2]

YEAS—187

Allen, Ill.	Gillie	Pearson
Anderson, Calif.	Gore	Peterson, Ga.
Andresen	Gossett	Phelifer
August H.	Graham	William T.
Andrews	Grant, Ind.	Pittenger
Angell	Guyer	Ploeser
Arends	Gwynne	Plumley
Barden	Hall	Poage
Bates, Mass.	Edwin Arthur	Powers
Baumhart	Hall	Randolph
Bender	Leonard W.	Rankin, Miss.
Bennett	Halleck	Reece, Tenn.
Bishop	Hancock	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Harness	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton	Heldinger	Rees, Kans.
Bradley, Mich.	Hendricks	Rich
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Rizley
Burch	Hill, Colo.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Burdick	Hinshaw	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Hoffman	Robison, Ky.
Canfield	Holmes	Rockefeller
Carlson	Hope	Rockwell
Carter	Houston	Rodgers, Pa.
Chipperfield	Hull	Rogers, Okla.
Clason	Jarrett	Satterfield
Clevenger	Jenkins, Ohio	Sauthoff
Cluett	Jenks, N. H.	Shafer, Mich.
Coffee, Nebr.	Jennings	Short
Cooley	Johns	Simpson
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Maine
Courtney	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Cox	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Va.
Crawford	Jones	Smith, Wis.
Crowther	Jonkman	Snyder
Cunningham	Keefe	South
Curtis	Kefauver	Springer
Day	Kilburn	Stearns, N. H.
Dewey	Kilday	Stefan
Dies	Kinzer	Stevenson
Dirksen	Kieberg	Stratton
Disney	Knutson	Sumner, Ill.
Dondero	Kunkel	Sutphin
Douglas	Lambertson	Talle
Drewry	Landis	Tarver
Durham	LeCompte	Thill
Dworshak	Lewis	Thomas, N. J.
Eaton	McGehee	Tibbott
Eberhart	McGregor	Treadway
Elston	McLean	Vinson, Ga.
Engel	Martin, Iowa	Vorys, Ohio
Engelbright	Martin, Mass.	Wadsworth
Faddis	Mason	Wasielewski
Fellows	Merritt	Wheat
Fenton	Meyer, Md.	Whelchel
Fish	Michener	Whittington
Ford, Leland M.	Moser	Wigglesworth
Ford, Miss.	Mott	Wilson
Gale	Mundt	Wolcott
Gamble	Murray	Wolverton, N. J.
Gearhart	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gerlach	O'Brien, N. Y.	Woodrum, Va.
Gifford	O'Toole	Young
Gilchrist	Pace	Youngdahl
Gillette	Paddock	

NAYS—169

Allen, La.	Bloom	Brown, Ga.
Barnes	Boehne	Bryson
Bates, Ky.	Boggs	Bulwinkle
Beam	Boland	Burgin
Beckworth	Bonner	Byron
Beiter	Boren	Camp
Bell	Bradley, Pa.	Cannon, Fla.
Bland	Brooks	Capozzoli

Cartwright	Hook	Piauché
Casey, Mass.	Hunter	Priest
Celler	Imhoff	Rabaut
Chapman	Izac	Ramsey
Chapman	Jackson	Ramspeck
Cochran	Jarman	Rankin, Mont.
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson	Richards
Cole, Md.	Luther A.	Rivers
Collins	Johnson, Okla.	Robinson, Utah
Cooper	Johnson, W. Va.	Rogers, Mass.
Costello	Kelley, Pa.	Ro'ph
Cravens	Kelly, Ill.	Romjue
Creal	Kerr	Russell
Crosser	Kirwan	Sacks
Cullen	Kociakowski	Sanders
D'Alesandro	Kopplemann	Sasscer
Davis, Ohio	Kramer	Scanlon
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Schuetz
Delaney	Lea	Scrugham
Dickstein	Leavy	Secrest
Dingell	Lesinski	Shanley
Domengeaux	Ludlow	Sheppard
Doughton	McCormack	Sheridan
Downs	McGranery	Sikes
Duncan	McKeough	Smith, Wash.
Elliott, Mass.	McLaughlin	Smith, W. Va.
Fitzgerald	McMillan	Sparkman
Fitzpatrick	Maclejewski	Spence
Flaherty	Maciora	Sullivan
Flannagan	Mahon	Sumners, Tex.
Fogarty	Manasco	Sweeney
Folger	Mansfield	Tenerowicz
Forand	Marcantonio	Terry
Ford, Thomas F.	May	Thom
Fulmer	Mills, Ark.	Thomas, Tex.
Gathings	Mills, La.	Thomason
Gibson	Monroney	Tolan
Grant, Ala.	Murdoch	Traynor
Green	Myers, Pa.	Voorhis, Calif.
Gregory	Nelson	Ward
Haines	Nichols	Weiss
Hare	Norrell	Welch
Harris, Ark.	O'Connor	White
Harris, Va.	Oliver	Whitten
Hart	O'Neal	Wickersham
Healey	Patman	Williams
Hébert	Patrick	Wright
Hill, Wash.	Peterson, Fla.	Zimmerman
Holbrook	Pierce	

NOT VOTING—73

Andersen, H. Carl	Harter	Osmer
Anderson, N. Mex.	Hartley	Patton
Arnold	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Baldwin	Hobbs	Joseph L.
Barry	Howell	Sabath
Boykin	Jacobson	Schaefer, Ill.
Fuck	Jensen	Schulte
Buckler, Minn.	Johnson	Scott
Buckley, N. Y.	Lyndon B.	Shannon
Byrne	Kean	Smith, Pa.
Cannon, Mo.	Kee	Somers, N. Y.
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Starnes, Ala.
Chenoweth	Martin J.	Steagall
Clark	Kennedy	Taber
Cole, N. Y.	Michael J.	Tinkham
Colmer	Keogh	Van Zandt
Culkin	Klein	Vincent, Ky.
Ditter	Larrabee	Vreeland
Edmiston	Lynch	Walter
Elliot, Calif.	McIntyre	Weaver
Ellis	Maas	Wene
Gavagan	Magnuson	West
Gehrmann	Mitchell	Winter
Granger	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Harrington	O'Day	Worley
	O'Hara	
	O'Leary	

So the amendments were agreed to.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Gehrmann.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Patton with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Osmer.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Mahon with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. West with Mr. Maas.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Walter with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Mitchell.
Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Magnuson.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Somers of New York.
Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Harter.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Elliott of California.
Mr. McIntyre with Mr. Michael J. Kennedy.
Mr. Arnold with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Wene.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Klein.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Edmiston.
Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Shannon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The clerk read as follows:

On page 2, after the period in line 15, insert "To aid the Secretary of War in the performance of his duties under this act and to perform such other functions relating to civilian defense as the Secretary of War may direct, there shall be an additional Assistant Secretary of War who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per annum. Upon the expiration of 6 months after the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, the office of Assistant Secretary of War herein created is abolished."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMASON) there were—ayes 136, noes 137.

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 178, nays 179, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—178

Allen, Ill.	Crawford	Gossett
Anderson, Calif.	Crowther	Graham
Andresen	Cunningham	Grant, Ind.
August H.	Curtis	Green
Andrews	Day	Guyer
Angell	Dewey	Hall
Arends	Dies	Edwin Arthur
Barden	Dirksen	Hall
Bates, Mass.	Disney	Leonard W.
Baumhart	Dondero	Halleck
Bender	Douglas	Hancock
Bennett	Drewry	Harness
Bishop	Dworshak	Hébert
Blackney	Eaton	Heldinger
Bolton	Eberhart	Hendricks
Bradley, Mich.	Elston	Hess
Brown, Ohio	Engel	Hinshaw
Burch	Englebright	Hoffman
Burdick	Faddis	Holmes
Butler	Fellows	Hope
Canfield	Fenton	Houston
Carlson	Fish	Jarrett
Carter	Ford, Leland M.	Jenkins, Ohio
Chipperfield	Ford, Miss.	Jenks, N. H.
Clason	Gale	Jennings
Clevenger	Gamble	Johns
Cluett	Gearhart	Johnson, Calif.
Coffee, Nebr.	Gerlach	Johnson, Ill.
Cooley	Gifford	Johnson, Ind.
Copeland	Gillette	Jones
Courtney	Gille	Jonkman
Cox	Gore	Kefauver

Kilburn  
Kilday  
Kinzer  
Kleberg  
Knutson  
Kunkel  
Lambertson  
Landis  
Lea  
Lewis  
McGehee  
McGregor  
McLean  
Martin, Iowa  
Martin, Mass.  
Mason  
Merritt  
Meyer, Md.  
Michener  
Moser  
Mundt  
Murray  
O'Brien, Mich.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Toole  
Pace  
Paddock  
Pearson

Peterson, Ga.  
Pfeiffer  
William T.  
Pittenger  
Floesser  
Plumley  
Poage  
Powers  
Randolph  
Rankin, Miss.  
Rankin, Mont.  
Reece, Tenn.  
Reed, Ill.  
Reed, N. Y.  
Rees, Kans.  
Rich  
Rizley  
Robertson,  
N. Dak.  
Robertson, Va.  
Robison, Ky.  
Rockefeller  
Rockwell  
Rodgers, Pa.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Satterfield  
Shafer, Mich.  
Short  
Simpson

Smith, Maine  
Smith, Ohio  
Smith, Va.  
Smith, Wis.  
Springer  
Starnes, Ala.  
Stearns, N. H.  
Stefan  
Stevenson  
Stratton  
Sumner, Ill.  
Sutphin  
Thill  
Thomas, N. J.  
Tibbott  
Treadway  
Vinson, Ga.  
Vorys, Ohio  
Wadsworth  
Wheat  
Whitten  
Whittington  
Wigglesworth  
Wilson  
Wolcott  
Wolverton, N. J.  
Woodruff, Mich.  
Woodrum, Va.  
Youngdahl

## NAYS—179

Allen, La.  
Barnes  
Bates, Ky.  
Beam  
Beckworth  
Belter  
Bell  
Bland  
Bloom  
Boehne  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bonner  
Boren  
Bradley, Pa.  
Brooks  
Brown, Ga.  
Bryson  
Buckler, Minn.  
Bulwinkle  
Burgin  
Byron  
Camp  
Cannon, Fla.  
Capozzoli  
Cartwright  
Casey, Mass.  
Celler  
Chapman  
Claypool  
Cochran  
Coffee, Wash.  
Cole, Md.  
Collins  
Cooper  
Costello  
Cravens  
Greal  
Cresser  
Cullen  
D'Alesandro  
Davis, Ohio  
Davis, Tenn.  
Delaney  
Dickstein  
Dingell  
Domengeaux  
Doughton  
Downs  
Duncan  
Durham  
Eliot, Mass.  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Flaherty  
Flannagan  
Fogarty  
Folger  
Forand  
Ford, Thomas F.  
Norrell

Fulmer  
Gathings  
Gibson  
Gilchrist  
Grant, Ala.  
Gregory  
Gwynne  
Haines  
Hare  
Harris, Ark.  
Harris, Va.  
Hart  
Harter  
Healey  
Hill, Wash.  
Holbrook  
Hook  
Hull  
Hunter  
Imhoff  
Izac  
Jackson  
Jarman  
Johnson  
Luther A.  
Johnson, Okla.  
Johnson, W. Va.  
Keefe  
Kelley, Pa.  
Kelly, Ill.  
Kerr  
Kirwan  
Kociakowski  
Kopplemann  
Kramer  
Lanham  
Leavy  
LeCompte  
Lesinski  
Ludlow  
McCormack  
McGranery  
McKeough  
McLaughlin  
McMillan  
Maciejewski  
Maciora  
Mahon  
Manasco  
Mansfield  
Marcantonio  
May  
Mills, Ark.  
Mills, La.  
Monroney  
Murdock  
Myers, Pa.  
Nelson  
Nichols  
Zimmerman

O'Connor  
Oliver  
O'Neal  
Patman  
Patrick  
Peterson, Fla.  
Pierce  
Plauche  
Priest  
Rabaut  
Ramsay  
Ramspeck  
Richards  
Rivers  
Robinson, Utah  
Rogers, Okla.  
Rolph  
Romjue  
Russell  
Sacks  
Sanders  
Sasscer  
Sauthoff  
Seanlon  
Schuetz  
Scrugham  
Secrest  
Shanley  
Sheppard  
Sheridan  
Sikes  
Smith, Wash.  
Smith, W. Va.  
South  
Sparkman  
Spence  
Sullivan  
Summers, Tex.  
Sweeney  
Talle  
Tarver  
Tenerowicz  
Terry  
Thom  
Thomas, Tex.  
Thomason  
Tolan  
Traynor  
Voorhis, Calif.  
Ward  
Wastelewski  
Weaver  
Welch  
Whelchel  
White  
Wickersham  
Williams  
Wright  
Young  
Zimmerman

## NOT VOTING—72

Andersen,  
H. Carl  
Anderson,  
N. Mex.  
Arnold  
Baldwin  
Barry  
Boykin  
Buck  
Buckley, N. Y.  
Byrne  
Cannon, Mo.  
Case, S. Dak.

Chenoweth  
Clark  
Cole, N. Y.  
Colmer  
Culkin  
Ditter  
Edmiston  
Elliott, Calif.  
Ellis  
Gavagan  
Gehrman  
Granger  
Harrington

Hartley  
Heffernan  
Hill, Colo.  
Hobbs  
Howell  
Jacobsen  
Jensen  
Johnson  
Lyndon B.  
Kean  
Kee  
Kennedy,  
Martin J.

Kennedy,  
Michael J.  
Keogh  
Klein  
Larrabee  
Lynch  
McIntyre  
Maas  
Magnuson  
Mitchell  
Norton  
O'Day  
O'Hara

O'Leary  
Osmer  
Patton  
Pfeifer  
Joseph L.  
Sabath  
Schaefer, Ill.  
Schulte  
Scott  
Shannon  
Smith, Pa.  
Snyder  
Somers, N. Y.

Steagall  
Taber  
Tinkham  
Van Zandt  
Vincent, Ky.  
Vreeland  
Walter  
Weiss  
Wene  
West  
Winter  
Wolfenden, Pa.  
Worley

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Ditter.  
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Jensen.  
Mr. Granger with Mr. Cole of New York.  
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Gehrmann.  
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Taber.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Kean.  
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Hartley.  
Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. O'Hara.  
Mr. Patton with Mr. Baldwin.  
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Scott.  
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Howell.  
Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Van Zant.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. West with Mr. Maas.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Walter with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Snyder with Mr. Hill of Colorado.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Osmer.

Mr. Shannon with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Norton.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Magnuson.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Somers of New York.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Buckley of New York.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Elliott.

Mr. McIntyre with Mr. Michael J. Kennedy.

Mr. Arnold with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Wene.

Mr. Buck with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Klein.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Edmiston.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the House listening when his name was called?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1926, to provide protection of persons and property from bombing attacks in the United States, and for

other purposes, and that it be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the provisions of the House bill (H. R. 5727).

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the Senate bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings by which the House bill was passed will be vacated, and the House bill be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and insert a speech delivered by Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD before the Texas waterways conference and also a speech delivered by Mr. Roy Miller before the same conference, December 16, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Mr. Roswell McGill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, on Federal taxation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter written by myself to the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks with regard to bankers and war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the close of the legislative business, and other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Mr. Hagie, the secretary of the National Reclamation Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech by Mr. Russell Amory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all special orders today I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article from the New Republic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter to a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Morrison (Ill.) Daily Herald of January 5, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### VISITORS TO UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia and Mr. TABER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 7, 1942.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public, No. 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.) I have appointed the following members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the calendar year 1942: Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN, Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, Hon. JAMES C. OLIVER. As chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex-officio member of the Board.

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND,  
Chairman.

#### PAY ACCUMULATED LEAVE TO EMPLOYEES IN ARMED FORCES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6023) to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I know what the bill is. It is a very deserving bill, but may I suggest that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia make a brief statement for the Record?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I will be glad to do that. In August last year the Congress passed legislation providing that employees of the Government who were drafted into the armed forces should have the right to either retain their accumulated leave or to receive pay for it. Inadvertently those who volunteered were not included in that privilege. This bill simply corrects that oversight and gives the same treatment to the volunteers that is received by the selectees.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The bill was reported out unanimously by the committee?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The committee felt it was the least the committee could do, only a matter of common justice?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. The committee made a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act making provisions for payment of employees of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, for accumulated or accrued annual leave when ordered to active duty with the military or naval forces of the United States," approved August 1, 1941, is amended to read as follows:*

"That employees of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia (including employees of any corporation created under authority of an act of Congress which is either wholly controlled or wholly owned by the United States Government, or any corporation, all the stock of which is owned or controlled by the United States Government, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, whether or not the employees thereof are paid from funds appropriated by Congress), who, have heretofore or who may hereafter be ordered to active duty with, or who voluntarily enlist for service with, or who have on or after the date of the enactment of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 voluntarily enlisted for service with the military or naval forces of the United States, shall be entitled to receive, in addition to their military pay, compensation in their civilian positions covering their accumulated or current accrued leave, or to elect to have such leave remain to their credit until their return from active military or naval service."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 10, strike out all after the word "who," down to and including the word "States" in line 15 and insert: "subsequent to May 1, 1940, shall have entered upon active military or naval service in the land or naval forces of the United States by voluntary enlistment or otherwise."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Delegate from Alaska is entitled to be recognized for 1 hour.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent to yield back the time granted me to speak today and instead I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### ARMY CANTONMENT IN BARTHOLOMEW COUNTY, IND.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by the War Department of the final decision to locate an Army cantonment in Bartholomew County, near Columbus, Ind. Columbus and Bartholomew County make up one of the finest, most stable communities I have ever known. The county has some of the finest soil in the State of Indiana. The farmers are typical of those of pioneer days, willing to toil long and hard, as has always been the farmer's lot, in order to "pull his own weight." In other words, they still believe it is their lot in life to earn their living by the sweat of their brow. There, community life is on a very high social and cultural plane. I fully realize, as I am sure they do, that their sacrifices are going to be great, but, Mr. Speaker, I assure you now that the good citizens of Bartholomew County, despite the inconveniences and heartaches that are sure to come, will be brave in every sense and do their part.

As for the city of Columbus, I can say that I have thought of it as an ideal city, stable as can be, and also made up of a homogeneous group of people, unsurpassed in their social and cultural life by any city I have ever visited. I am acquainted with both their county and city governments and I can assure America that nowhere can you find a more cooperative group of people.

For several months the people of the city of Columbus and Bartholomew County have felt that this camp or cantonment was sure to be located in and near their boundaries. They have wondered what effect it might have on their lives and their businesses. They have known that such a project would tax their facilities, but they have not complained—they have not protested. Long before the international situation became so critical, while we were still an

united people, and minority groups refused to make any sacrifices, the people of Bartholomew County were saying that "if it is in the interest of national defense, if it is the part we are to play, let it come; we are ready to make the best of it."

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to quote from an extra edition of the Columbus Evening Republican, which did not hesitate to break a 25-year precedent to give the citizens of that area the news that the cantonment was to be located there. The paper said, quoting an editorial of months ago:

This is not the sort of thing that a chamber of commerce would go out to land for a city or county; but if the camp is located here, there will be only one thing to do—to recognize our obligations to the young men in training and make things as pleasant for them as we can. We would have the same obligations to these lads as we hope other communities are acknowledging to our own who have been sent to other camps.

I could not close this observation without saying that I am claiming no credit for the location of this camp. In these trying times we must have confidence in the ability of our Army and Navy staff to locate defense activities in most strategic places.

All my life I have carried the slogan: "By hard work we will win." I think that slogan still holds good. In addition, and since taking my seat in Congress, I have adopted this slogan: "It matters not what happens to me, it's my country." Such is true of the people of Bartholomew County and of the city of Columbus. They place their country's welfare ahead of any personal ambition.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### THE SOO LOCKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late and I shall not take much of the time of the House.

On yesterday I called attention to the remarkable record that was made by that great fleet of ore carriers on the Great Lakes which during this past season carried approximately 89,000,000 tons of iron ore from the upper lake ports to the great steel furnaces in the Middle West. That was a 25-percent increase over its previous record season of 1940. During that same navigation season of 1941, 110,000,000 tons of bulk freight passed through the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. This is a greater tonnage than has ever gone through the Panama Canal, the Suez Canal, and the Welland Canal combined in any 12-month period in any year.

The President in his message the other day called upon the Nation to increase its production efforts, particularly its all-important steel production. Mr. Speaker, this steel production increase cannot be achieved until this Congress sees fit to pass an authorization measure and appropriate approximately \$3,000,000 to provide for an additional lock at the Soo, because the present locks have now reached their maximum operating capacity. Such an authorization measure has been pending before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House for

many months. The military authorities at the Soo have long been ready to start construction work immediately after this Congress authorizes them to do so. The committee has approved of that authorization measure but they have not yet reported it to the floor of this House because of the fact they have buried it in the billion dollar so-called pork-barrel rivers-and-harbors omnibus bill. Both the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and I have repeatedly urged the committee to report out separately this bill for the additional lock at the Soo, but it appears that congressional precedents have been exercised to overrule us on this very important question. I am certain that if the committee would report that bill separately to the floor of this House it would be passed by a unanimous vote, not only by the House but by the other body of the Congress.

Just how vitally important this additional lock will be to the war-production picture was graphically illustrated last August at the height of the shipping season. There are at present three locks in operation at the Soo. The original small lock, known as the Poe lock, is entirely too small, so that its operation has been discontinued for a number of years. It is at the site of this original lock that it is proposed to build this new or so-called fourth lock. Last August, due to the collapse of a part of the railroad bridge which crosses the entrance to the locks, all shipments of iron ore and other commodities were suspended for 4 days. This resulted in a shipping loss estimated in excess of 1,000,000 gross tons. This international railroad bridge between the United States and Canada is of such importance that it cannot be moved and will still remain an operating hazard, even though the fourth lock is constructed. However, I cite this accident merely to show how serious any suspension of operation of these locks is to the entire war-victory program because of the fact that the present three locks in operation have reached their maximum operating efficiency, if not their maximum operating capacity.

This brings up another important angle that I want to point out, Mr. Speaker; that is, to impress upon this Congress that these vital Soo locks, controlling as they do the flow of 85 percent of the Nation's iron-ore supply, are, in reality, America's No. 1 air target. Enemy planes operating on skis during the winter or on floats in the summer can sneak into the remote regions of Hudson Bay merely 200 miles north of the Soo and bomb those locks to complete destruction within but a very few minutes and with but a few well-placed bombs.

We have a military police battalion stationed at the Soo right now charged with the responsibility of protecting those locks, but they have no adequate equipment with which to do anything more than prevent destruction of the locks through acts of sabotage. As a matter of fact, such anti-aircraft equipment as had been stationed at the Soo previously in the nature of guns and searchlights were transferred from the Soo very shortly after the war began in 1939 and have not yet been replaced.

Day before yesterday I again urged the Secretary of War in a detailed letter to station at the Soo a squadron of fighter planes together with anti-aircraft detection devices. I also requested mobile anti-aircraft-gun equipment and antitank equipment, and, finally, requested that these fighter planes as soon as possible be supplemented by a light bomber squadron. I request this minimum of vitally needed equipment at this time simply because we are all fully cognizant of our woeful state of unpreparedness and our woeful lack of adequate equipment sufficient to properly protect all of our vital targets.

The Soo is only about 45 minutes from our big pursuit air base at Selfridge Field, Mich., from which those fighter planes permanently stationed at the Soo could be supported by sufficient additional fighters which ought to be able to ward off the enemy successfully; but, Mr. Speaker, again I call your attention to the fact that the Soo is America's No. 1 target from a strategic military viewpoint.

Lest the uninformed scoff at the danger from enemy air attack alone, let me point out another aerial danger to these locks. We have in this country some 25,000 private airplanes from the little grasshoppers up to huge transports. We have approximately 100,000 private or civilian pilots. Unquestionably in that number there may be some subversive or weak individuals whose services could be bought by the enemy. Even one small grasshopper plane at night filled with high explosives could either drop bombs therefrom or could even be flown headlong into the locks by some maniac, suicidal pilot, and that might cause destructive damage which would take months to repair, and the military authorities now stationed at the Soo with the equipment now on hand would be absolutely powerless to prevent it. True, through the very prompt and commendable action taken by the C. A. A. and through the efforts now being made by the civil-air patrol officials, this hazard is rapidly being minimized but some hazard, too great a hazard, from this source will ever remain a potential threat to the safety of the Soo locks until you give those locks proper equipment for adequate protection.

All this is recognized by our air force, by the combat air force itself, yet we have not provided adequate protection, and by congressional inaction we have failed to provide for the new lock at the Soo so vitally needed to meet the President's request for additional steel tonnage for this Nation and our Allies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks two newspaper editorials on this important subject from the Soo Evening News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The newspaper articles referred to follow:

[From the Soo Evening News]

#### PROTECT THE LOCKS

Take a globe map or map of the world looking down upon the North Pole. Measure the distance between Tokyo and San Francisco, and then measure the distance from Tokyo



to the Sault locks. Only a fraction of an inch of difference by the "top of the world," or great circle routes.

This fact should make every citizen and every military man know what can happen to the west coast, which is being so elaborately guarded these days, could happen here at this vital point in the steel and grain commerce of the world.

When the Japs slipped into Pearl Harbor bringing destruction and death, the common citizens and, apparently, the military and naval authorities themselves, were as surprised as they were stunned. If the same thing is tried here, either by the Japs or the Hitler bombing forces, will there be the same surprise and crushing damage?

Certainly if there is scientific method of combating enemy attacks upon Sault Ste. Marie, it should be taken. Methods of noting in advance any advancing planes should be set up, of course. The possible bases of operations for our enemies in the Hudson Bay region should be carefully watched. Most modern defense weapons, that could sweep the sky, including available fighter planes ready to take off on an instant's notice, should be here. It is idle to say that there is little probability of an attack before spring shipping starts.

Uncle Sam will want a hundred million tons of iron ore to pass the Sault locks next season. In terms of defense, that is the most important item in all industry. Not one chance of permitting a stoppage of this traffic should be taken.

Attention War Department.

#### SAFEGUARD THIS CHANNEL

It was an impressive meeting that the chamber of commerce conducted yesterday honoring the 1941 performance of the lake carriers in breaking all previous records for the transportation of ore.

But to many thoughtful minds pride in the achievement must have underlined the apprehension widely shared in the Great Lakes region over what is perhaps the grossest and most wanton item of neglect in the whole plan for defending America. We refer to the failure of the administration and Congress to have provided, many months ago, extra sets of locks in the Soo Canal, through which much of the lake traffic passes.

The total traffic of the Great Lakes exceeds by far the total of all the ocean commerce of the United States. The traffic through the Soo is far greater in tonnage than that through the Panama Canal. And it is of such a character that not even a beginning could be made on the program that President Roosevelt outlined yesterday if the traffic through the Soo in the shipping season were stopped or curtailed. In fact, we could not keep production near to the point it has already achieved, and it might almost cease throughout the vast industrial districts of Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York, and in most of the rest of the country, all of which depends largely on this region for its steel.

It has been pointed out repeatedly that to bomb the Soo by flying boats hopping off Hudson's Bay, or from a carrier that might sneak into that vast sea, would be technically easier for the Germans to accomplish than it was for the Japs to bomb Pearl Harbor. The distances are shorter, and the opportunity for surprise even greater, since the problem of patrolling the wastes of the North is extremely difficult.

Provision for new locks is contained in the vast, billion-dollar, omnibus pork barrel rivers and harbors bill, one of the most disgraceful measures ever presented to Congress in a time of emergency. The enactment of that gigantic political fraud would be a catastrophe in itself, not equal in magnitude to the bombing of the Soo. To be sure, but certainly a sizeable disaster.

An appropriation for spare locks at the Soo is so urgent a necessity that it should

be instantly enacted in a separate measure—should have been enacted at least as long ago as the lend-lease bill. The negligence of those responsible for the failure to do so is at least equal to that of any naval or military commander under investigation at Honolulu.

The people who know this necessity have not raised their voices loudly lest they be charged with pointing out to the enemy a vital weak spot in the whole system of American and Allied defense. But the enemy cannot possibly be ignorant of that which Congress and the administration still choose to ignore.

From this region, which knows fully the importance of the Soo to the Nation, must go up a clamor that will be heard. For without action, this Nation faces the risk of a disaster at the Soo compared to which Pearl Harbor would be an incident. On the maintenance of that channel, in plain and simple language, this country is dependent for its ability to produce munitions of war in any considerable volume whatever.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky, indefinitely (at the request of Mr. GREGORY), on account of illness.

To Mr. PACE, for tomorrow, on account of important business.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4077. An act to amend the District of Columbia License Act so as to permit the transportation of school children and occasional sightseeing operations in the District of Columbia without procurement of a license or payment of a tax in the case of certain vehicles performing such operations in connection with transportation to the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5464. An act to authorize transfer of enlisted men of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve to the Regular Navy and Marine Corps; and

H. R. 6163. An act to prohibit parking of vehicles upon public or private property in the District of Columbia without the consent of the owner of such property.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2149. An act to amend the act approved April 22, 1941 (Public, No. 39, 77th Cong.), so as to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 9, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1257. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for disposition by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1258. A letter from the Secretary, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting its annual report of the United

States Employees' Compensation Commission covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1259. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of May 28, 1896, as amended, relating to the appointment of assistant United States attorneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1260. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for temporary promotion in the Army of the United States of officers commissioned in the Air Corps or assigned to duty with the Air Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs, House Joint Resolution 219. Joint resolution to enable the United States to become an adhering member of the Inter-American Statistical Institute; with amendment (Rept. No. 1572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6210) granting an increase of pension to Frances Beach Taylor, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6332. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Chickamauga-Chattanooga National Military Park in the States of Georgia and Tennessee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6333. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H. R. 6338. A bill to provide for Federal aid to the several States in carrying out plans for industrial rehabilitation in the counties thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 6339. A bill to provide for Federal aid to the several States in carrying out plans for industrial rehabilitation in the counties thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. Res. 402. Resolution authorizing the printing of the proceedings in the House of Representatives on December 19, 1941, commemorating the service of William Tyler Page; to the Committee on Printing.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 6334. A bill for the relief of Ralph Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 6335. A bill for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae

Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 6336. A bill granting an increase of pension to Katharine H. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 6337. A bill for the relief of William H. Linhart; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under class 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2262. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, urging that the Congress of the United States act favorably upon and enact into law House bill 5727; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2263. Also, petition of the assembly and the Senate of the State of California, urging the President and Congress of the United States to prevent any and all racial discriminations in the national-defense program, including admittance into the armed forces, employment in defense industries, and in the vocational program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2264. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as will insure that supplies sufficient to meet the needs of the farmers of the State of California for agriculture equipment during the coming season will be furnished the farm machinery and manufacturing industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2265. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, requesting the President and the Congress of the United States do all things possible at any early date to make available to the department of public works of the State of California sufficient funds to put the highways of California in an adequate condition for national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2266. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of California, expressing their disapproval and condemnation of any plan to federalize State unemployment insurance and employment services, and do hereby urge that Congress refuse to enact into law any federalization scheme; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2267. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of California, urging and requesting the Federal Social Security Administration to reexamine present old-age pension schedules with the objective of making such adjustments in the schedules as may be deemed proper to meet the changes in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2268. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of California, urging that in order to maintain the morale of the people of the United States athletic and sporting events should not be canceled unless imperative to the success of the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2269. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the State of California, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4, relating to priorities for the manufacture of farm machinery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2270. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Long Island Chapter, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 1942

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 6, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Creator Spirit, who didst brood upon the face of the waters till God's word was uttered, and, lo, the foundations of the world were bathed in light supernal: Come breathe Thy breath upon us and set us free from sin and all uncleanness, making us temples worthier Thee.

Incline our inmost souls to Thee, that, like growing flowers leaning to the light, they may one day blossom into perfect prayer within the sacred precincts of Thy patience. And if Thou callest us to surrender our life's passion and its splendour, the flower of soul and sense, for one dark night of pain, may we yield Thee quick obedience, knowing full well that sorrow endureth for a night, but joy cometh in the morning.

So come and abide in Thy gentleness, O Blessed Spirit, whom with the Father and the Son, together, we worship and glorify as one God, world without end. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, January 8, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1936) to provide protection of persons and property from bombing attacks in the United States, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6023) to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bone	Butler
Austin	Brewster	Byrd
Bayley	Brooks	Capper
Ball	Brown	Caraway
Bankhead	Bulow	Chandler
Barkley	Bunker	Chavez
Blibo	Burton	Clark, Idaho

Clark, Mo.	Langer	Rosier
Connally	Lee	Russell
Danaher	Lodge	Schwartz
Davis	Lucas	Shipstead
Downey	McCarran	Spencer
Doxey	McFarland	Taft
Ellender	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
George	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Gerry	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	Maybank	Tobey
Glass	Mead	Truman
Green	Millikin	Tunnell
Guffey	Murdock	Tydings
Gurney	Murray	Wallgren
Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Hill	O'Daniel	Wagner
Holman	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Hughes	Overton	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	White
Kilgore	Reed	Wiley
La Follette	Reynolds	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. Andrews and Mr. Pepper], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Smith], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Stewart] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges] is confined to a hospital due to a recent hip injury.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Barbour] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, the Chair designates the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Herring], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Hughes], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Brewster] as the appointive members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to visit the Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### REPORT ON SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 705 aliens whose deportation he has suspended for more than 6 months under authority of law, together with a statement of the reasons for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

#### BOARDS OF LOCAL INSPECTORS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, that by Order No. 105, dated April 18, 1941, published in the Federal Register of April 19, 1941, the Secretary of Commerce abolished as of the close of business May 31, 1941, the board of local inspectors at Evansville, Ind., and established a new board at Cairo, Ill., effective June 1, 1941; to the Committee on Commerce.

#### REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, submitting, pursuant to law, his report of the work of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year ended